



Edwards, Heather (1985) *The charters of the early West Saxon kingdom*.

PhD thesis

<http://theses.gla.ac.uk/3987/>

Copyright and moral rights for this thesis are retained by the author

A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge

This thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the Author

The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the Author

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given

THE CHARTERS
OF THE EARLY
WEST SAXON KINGDOM

Heather Edwards

Ph.D. Thesis
Department of Medieval History
The University of Glasgow

August 1985

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
<u>SUMMARY</u>	1
<u>I. PREFACE</u>	3
<u>II. THE CHARTERS</u>	6
<u>A. WEST SAXON ARCHIVES</u>	6
1. Glastonbury	6
2. Malmesbury	127
3. Winchester	208
4. Abingdon	265
5. Muchelney	315
6. Bath	332
7. Shaftesbury	361
8. Sherborne	375
9. Exeter	397
10. Wells	406
11. Athelney	412
<u>B. OTHER ARCHIVES</u>	
1. Christ Church, Canterbury	417
2. Rochester	439
3. St. Augustine's, Canterbury	451
4. Chichester	455
5. Peterborough	469
6. Westminster	479
<u>III. CONCLUSIONS</u>	
A. West Saxon Diplomatic	484
B. Analysis of the Early West Saxon Charters	491
INDEX OF CHARTERS	495
BIBLIOGRAPHY AND ABBREVIATIONS	497

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thanks are due first and foremost to my supervisor, Mr. Patrick Wormald, for his expert advice and guidance, his generosity in making the results of his own work available to me, his unfailing enthusiasm for the subject, and his encouragement and support throughout.

I should also like to thank Dr. Nicholas Brooks for his advice, assistance and support; the Institute of Historical Research for enabling me to continue my research for an extra year; and David, Fiona, John, Priscilla and Tom.

SUMMARY

This thesis relates to the earliest West Saxon charters, that is those dating from the period c. 670 to the end of the reign of Ecgberht in 839. All charters which have any direct and specific relevance to the West Saxon kingdom in this period are included.

The early West Saxon charters are among the most problematical and neglected of all Anglo-Saxon charters. There are various reasons for this: only a small amount of material survives, and it is difficult to form any judgment^e of, or base any conclusions on, such fragmentary evidence; there are no original West Saxon charters for the period before 838, and consequently no fixed point from which a study of the material could proceed; the main collections, such as those of Malmesbury and Glastonbury, have been widely regarded with suspicion; there is a dearth of other types of evidence for the period which might have illuminated the charters; and the whole period has been largely neglected by modern historians in comparison with the earlier and later periods of West Saxon history. The purpose of this study is to examine each of the documents in detail, to establish as far as possible which of the texts or portions of them are authentic, and to identify a body of genuine material which scholars may in future use as historical evidence with some confidence.

Charters are arranged under the archives in which they survived in the medieval period, and each document is discussed individually. Judgements regarding authenticity are presented, and, where the document is genuine in whole or in part, some attempt is made to suggest the historical conclusions which can be drawn from it. A summary of early West Saxon diplomatic is provided and an analysis of the charters according to authenticity.

The chief conclusion of this study is that a substantial proportion

of the early West Saxon charters are authentic in whole or in part, and that they constitute a considerable body of evidence for the history of the early West Saxon kingdom.

I. PREFACE

This thesis relates to the earliest extant West Saxon charters. The period covered is from the date of the earliest survivals, c. 670, to the end of the reign of Ecgberht in 839. This section of West Saxon history has been largely neglected by modern historians in comparison with the earlier and later periods of West Saxon history. A great deal of attention has focussed on the invasion period, the earliest West Saxon leaders and the problems presented by the Chronicle's account of fifth-century and sixth-century Wessex. And a great deal of work has been done on the period of the Viking attacks and in particular on the reign of Ælfred. But the late seventh, eighth and early ninth centuries remain comparatively obscure.

The West Saxon charters of this period have also been neglected in comparison with those of other centuries and other areas. Various reasons may be suggested for this: only a small amount of material survives, and it is difficult to form any judgement of, or base any conclusions on, such fragmentary evidence; there are no original West Saxon charters for the period before 838, and consequently no fixed point from which a study of the material could proceed; the main collections, such as those of Glastonbury and Malmesbury, have been widely regarded with suspicion; and there is a dearth of other types of evidence for the period which might have illuminated the charters, the information of the Chronicle, for example, being scanty and open to question on some points, particularly as regards dating. The most substantial recent discussion of early Anglo-Saxon diplomatic (Scharer 1982) omits the West Saxon material almost entirely.

The intention of this piece of research is therefore to fill in this gap to some extent by providing a detailed account of the early

West Saxon charters, establishing as far as possible which texts or portions of texts are authentic, and hence identifying a body of valid historical evidence for the history of the early West Saxon kingdom.

All charters of this period deriving from the archives of religious establishments which were situated within the West Saxon kingdom during all or part of the period are included. In the case of some border monasteries this entails the inclusion of a number of charters which are in no other respect West Saxon. Charters from archives outside Wessex are included only if they significantly involve West Saxon people or have some other direct relevance to Wessex. Two of the West Saxon archives, Glastonbury and Malmesbury, contain papal privileges, and these are also discussed.

Charters are grouped according to the monastic archives in which they were ~~preserved during~~ medieval times, disregarding the later dispersal of many of these archives. Single sheets of uncertain provenance are added as appendices to the archives to which they seem most likely to have belonged. The order in which the West Saxon archives are discussed is dictated by the numbers of early West Saxon charters which they contain, so that the major collections of Glastonbury and Malmesbury are placed first, and archives containing only one or two relevant documents are added at the end. Archives from outside Wessex are then arranged in much the same way, but other collections from Kent are placed after that of Christ Church, Canterbury. As a general rule, each charter is discussed individually, but there are a few cases in which closely connected charters have been considered jointly, either in place of separate discussions or to supplement them. As far as possible, each individual discussion has been made complete in itself, but excessive repetition has been avoided by reference to earlier accounts where appropriate. To eliminate a great deal of cross-referencing, an index

of all the charters considered in detail is provided.

Every effort has been made to consult as many manuscripts of the charters as possible. In some cases photocopies, microfilms or facsimiles have been used, and in a few instances it has been necessary to work from editions. At the head of each discussion there is a note of the manuscript or edition which has been used as the main source for the text and from which quotations are taken. Charters are referred to by their numbers in P.H. Sawyer's Anglo-Saxon Charters: An Annotated Handlist and Bibliography (abbreviated as S). Documents such as papal privileges which are not included by Sawyer are referred to by the best edition. Traditional counties are used, disregarding modern local government units.

II. THE CHARTERS

A. WEST SAXON ARCHIVES

1. GLASTONBURY

	<u>Page</u>
(a) <u>Introduction</u>	7
(i) The cartulary	7
(ii) The <u>Liber Terrarum</u>	8
(iii) The 1247 inventory of charters	11
(iv) William of Malmesbury	12
(v) The abbatial list	13
 (b) <u>The Charters</u>	 18
<u>S</u>	
236 Baldred, king, to Hæmgils, abbot	19
237 Centwine, king, to Hæmgils, abbot	26
1249 Hæddi, bishop to Hæmgils, abbot	31
227 Coenwalh, king, to Berhtwald, abbot	34
238 Ine, king, to Hæmgils, abbot	39
246 Ine, king, to Glastonbury	43
248 Ine, king, to Berhtwald, abbot	45
247 Ine, king, to Berhtwald, abbot	56
1253 Forthere, bishop, to Ealdberht, abbot	58
250 Ine, king, to Glastonbury	61
251 Ine, king, to Glastonbury	64
253 Æthilheard, king, to Glastonbury	67
1410 Lulle, nun, to Tunberht, abbot	69
257 Cuthred, king, to Glastonbury	75
Wordings of the five mid-eighth-century charters	81
The papal privilege and S152, Coenwulf, king, to Cynehelm . .	85
270a Eadburh, queen, to Eadgils	92
<u>Appendix</u>	
264 Cyniwulf, king, to Bica	97
 (c) <u>The Lost Charters</u>	 102
 (d) <u>Conclusions</u>	 125

(a) Introduction

(i) The Cartulary

There are two surviving manuscripts of the Glastonbury cartulary, of which the earlier, known as the Great Chartulary, is now manuscript 39 at Longleat House. It was edited in the 1940s and 50s by Dom Aelred Watkin for the Somerset Record Society (Watkin, Glastonbury Cart.).

The other manuscript was made for the abbot's use, and is called the Secretum Domini, now Bodleian Wood empt. 1. The contents of the two volumes are almost identical, and a comparison shows that the Secretum Domini is a copy of the Great Chartulary: documents cancelled in the latter are omitted from the former, and scribal errors in the earlier manuscript are repeated in the later one, which also includes many more mistakes. As a text of the cartulary the Secretum Domini is greatly inferior, and consequently Watkin provides a better edition of the charters than Birch in the Cartularium Saxonicum in cases where the documents only survive in the cartulary, since Birch only saw the Secretum Domini.

The Secretum Domini was apparently completed by 1342-3, since it is mentioned in the Glastonbury Feodary, which dates from that time (Weaver, Glastonbury Feodary, p. 2), and the latest document in it dates from 1342. The Great Chartulary lacks the last document, its latest entry relating to 1340, and it was probably written c. 1338-40, the Secretum Domini being begun as soon as the earlier manuscript was complete. The Secretum Domini is a handsome fair copy; the Great Chartulary is quite plain, written in a single fourteenth-century hand with no ornamentation except for the addition of headings and crosses in red. It appears that the scribe worked from single sheets, which he regarded as originals, where possible; in cases where he worked from a transcript, this is noted: 'per copiam'. The contents include documents relating to the

abbey's rights and privileges, followed by charters arranged topographically with some miscellaneous additions at the end (On the date and description of the two manuscripts, see Watkin, Glastonbury Cart., pp. ix-xii; Davis 1958, nos. 434, 435). The estates which are the subject of charters surviving in the cartulary largely correspond with those named in Domesday Book as possessions of Glastonbury in 1066, and it seems that the cartularist intention was to preserve deeds relating to lands still held by the abbey, other deeds being discarded.

(ii) The Liber Terrarum

Manuscript R.5.33 in the library of Trinity College, Cambridge, consists of two thirteenth-century manuscripts bound together. One contains the accounts of the history of Glastonbury by Adam of Domesham and William of Malmesbury; the other has a number of lists relating to Glastonbury records drawn up in 1247. One of these is headed 'Carte contente in libro terrarum Glastonie', and is evidently a list of the contents of a lost Glastonbury cartulary (Edited by Hearne, John of Glastonbury, pp. 370-5; discussed by Robinson 1921, pp. 44-7; and Keynes 1976, pp. 167-86). Another of the lists is of the books in the Glastonbury library, and this includes the Liber Terrarum (Hearne, John of Glastonbury, p. 435). An annotator brought the library catalogue up to date in 1248, adding some books and deleting others. He deleted the Liber Terrarum, which probably indicates that the book had been discarded, although it is perhaps just possible that the annotator felt that the book should not be in the library catalogue, which contains no other internal Glastonbury record, and deleted it solely for that reason. A note in the fourteenth-century Great Chartulary refers to three charters with bounds 'quos in libro qui dicitur Londe Bok qui uoluerit legere poterit' (Watkin, Glastonbury Cart., p. 644), which

tends to suggest that the book was still extant, but it may be that the cartularist was merely transcribing an earlier note, and there is no clear evidence that the Liber Terrarum survived after 1248. The charters which the fourteenth-century cartularist transcribed from copies may have been taken from another cartulary which superseded the Liber Terrarum, and was in turn discarded when the Great Chartulary was complete.

The date of the compilation of the Liber Terrarum is disputed. The latest charters in it date from the reign of Æthelred, and none can be securely assigned to a date later than 984. The late tenth century is therefore the earliest possible date of compilation, but it is not certain that the volume was produced as early as this. The compiler is known to have omitted some surviving early charters, and may simply have omitted the later ones, of which it seems there were very few. The Great Chartulary includes only one charter dating from the period between the end of Æthelred's reign and the Conquest, and this is a privilege in Knutr's name which is probably spurious (S966), while William of Malmesbury only adds one other document, a grant of land by Eadmund Ironside (ECW, no. 618). There is no clear evidence that William of Malmesbury used the Liber Terrarum, but the charter material he records corresponds closely with that in the contents list, and it is most unlikely that the volume was not available to him. Dr. Simon Keynes argues for a late eleventh- or early twelfth-century date of compilation (Keynes, 1976, pp. 167-86), but there are reasons for postulating an earlier date. The book was described in 1247 as 'vetust. set legibilis', which tends to suggest that it dated from a much earlier period. It included more than one grant of privileges, but the 'Great Privilege of Ine' (S250) is not included, and it is unlikely that this would have been omitted if it had been available to the compiler. The document probably dates from the century following the Conquest, and the fact that neither

this nor any other identifiably post-Conquest material is included suggests that the Liber Terrarum was probably compiled before the Conquest.

In the most recent discussion a late tenth- or early eleventh-century date is suggested (Lapidge 1982⁶, pp. 167-86).

The order of the charters in the list is somewhat haphazard. The compiler appears to have begun with the intention of arranging his material in approximate chronological order: all but two of the first 31 charters relate to the period before 800, and all seventh-century charters occur among the first 13 entries; among the remaining 106 items, only six relate to the eighth century. But no attempt seems to have been made to put the few ninth-century and numerous tenth-century charters into a chronological sequence, and these seem to be in no particular order, except that charters relating to the same estates are often grouped together. There was evidently a complete reorganisation of Glastonbury charters before the fourteenth-century cartulary was compiled.

The charters appear to have been numbered, either by the original scribe or by a later annotator, as endorsements to two extant charters state their numbers in the 'Landbok' (S236, 563). These fit the surviving contents list, showing that it is accurate and complete. It should be noted that the fifth item, marked 'II', counted as two. The endorsements are thirteenth-century, and therefore add nothing to our information concerning the date of the book.

Numerous charters included in the Liber Terrarum were not included in the Great Chartulary and do not survive, and many of these are recorded only in the list of the contents of the Liber Terrarum and in William of Malmesbury's De Antiquitate Glastonie Ecclesie, discussed below. These two sources therefore add considerably to our knowledge of early grants to Glastonbury. Most entries in the list name the donor,

the beneficiary and the estate, but the beneficiary of a few early charters is not stated. Some entries are marked 'G' and others 'S' or 'S. qui G.', and a rubric explains that the former indicates a direct grant to Glastonbury, while the latter is used for grants to laypersons, 'servientibus', through whom the estates were transferred to Glastonbury. Some entries have neither initial, and in these cases it may be that the compiler believed the lands concerned not to have been owned by the monastery, or that he did not know how the estates came into its possession. Some of the grants to laymen may have been merely deposited at Glastonbury for safe-keeping. One charter included in the Liber Terrarum now survives in the Abingdon cartulary (S564; LT 109). In many cases there is reason to believe that the charters not now extant were genuine, but it cannot be assumed that all were: the Liber Terrarum contained at least one fabricated charter (S227; LT 3). The lost charters recorded here and elsewhere are discussed individually below. References to the Liber Terrarum contents list are given in the form LT plus the number of the document.

(iii) The 1247 Inventory of Charters

Following the details of the Liber Terrarum in the Cambridge manuscript is an inventory of the charters surviving in 1247 (Edited by Hearne, John of Glastonbury, pp. 375-9; discussed by Keynes 1976, pp. 167-86). The compiler specifies whether or not the charters have seals, and, as this is a question which could not arise in the case of cartulary copies, it appears that the list is of single sheets. Many charters mentioned in the Liber Terrarum are not in this inventory, probably because they were extant only in transcripts in the Liber Terrarum itself and elsewhere.

The charters are classified under headings as follows; the

letters are those assigned to the lists by Dr. Keynes (Keynes 1976, Appendix to Vol. 1):-

List A: grants by kings to Glastonbury of lands still owned.

List B: grants by kings to laymen of lands still owned
by Glastonbury.

List C: grants to Glastonbury of lands not still owned.

List D: grants by kings to laymen of lands which Glastonbury
is believed to have owned but which it does not still
own.

Details of indulgences and of post-Conquest royal charters (with seals) follow, and there is a list of three 'ancient privileges', the spurious charters of Ine, Eadgar and Patrick (S250, 783; B1).

Most of the charters in lists A and B survive, whilst most of those in lists C and D do not: the compiler of the Great Chartulary, arranging his material under the headings of Glastonbury's estates, naturally omitted those charters which he considered to relate to lands not then owned by the monastery. The inventory adds something to our knowledge of early charters, but its information is more limited than that of the Liber Terrarum contents list, notably in its omission of the names of beneficiaries in lists B and D. Its classification is useful, and it is helpful to know that single sheets of certain charters existed in the thirteenth century. References to the inventory below are given in the form IC plus the letter of the relevant list and the number of the item in that list.

(iv) William of Malmesbury's De Antiquitate Glastonie Ecclesie

A new edition of William's treatise on the history of Glastonbury has recently been published, and includes a thorough discussion of the work (DA). Consequently a detailed account of it here would be superfluous,

but one or two points concerning its value as a source for the period down to 839 may usefully be made. The problem of interpolation relates mainly to the early chapters dealing with pre-Saxon Glastonbury and with the relics which the abbey claimed to possess. The account of the monastery from the reign of Coenwalh (c. 641-c.672) onwards appears to be almost entirely William's work. It is largely based on charters, nearly all of which were in the Liber Terrarum, although not appearing there in the same order, since William's order is strictly chronological. William adds a few charters not recorded elsewhere, and gives additional details of many lost charters. He habitually gives the names of abbots cited as beneficiaries of grants to Glastonbury, and occasionally quotes part of the wording of a charter. Grants of privileges he quotes in full, and it is to this practice that we owe the preservation of pope Leo's letter granting ownership of Glastonbury to Cynehelm and the confirmatory charter of Coenwulf, king of the Mercians, which are not mentioned in any other source (DA, p. 108; Sl52, DA, p. 110. See further below).

In addition to the documentation in the Glastonbury archives, William examined and made use of physical remains at Glastonbury which dated from earlier periods of the monastery's history. The information he obtained in this way supplements the documentary evidence: for example, inscriptions on tombs sometimes confirm the existence of obscure abbots.

John of Glastonbury's Cronica sive Antiquitates Glastoniensis Ecclesie has also been recently edited and discussed (Carley, John of Glastonbury). It adds virtually nothing to William's account of the early Saxon period, and can scarcely be considered a source for the early history of Glastonbury.

(v) The Abbatial List

One of the manuscripts containing the 'Anglian collection' of

royal genealogies and regnal lists also includes a quantity of West Saxon material comprising a genealogy which traces the ancestry of the three sons of Eadgar, a West Saxon regnal list beginning with Cerdic and ending with Æthelred II, and a unique list of names without a heading, which has been identified as Glastonbury's abbatial list. The manuscript, Cotton Tiberius B v in the British Library, also contains lists of bishops, popes and emperors and other material, and dates from the first half of the eleventh century. Its medieval provenance was Battle Abbey, but Dr. David Dumville suggests that it may have been written at Christ Church for Winchester. The West Saxon material evidently originated at Glastonbury in the late tenth century (On the manuscript see Dumville 1976, pp. 26-8, 43; Ker 1957, no. 193; Page 1966, p. 12. On the abbatial list, see Robinson 1921, pp. 26-44; Dumville 1976, p. 43 n. 5).

The initial letters of names in the various lists in this manuscript are written in alternate red and green, and in some cases, in the Glastonbury list and elsewhere, the initials are wrong. It seems likely that the scribe who added the initial letters did not have the exemplar before him, and consequently did not always know what the initial should be. The Glastonbury abbatial list appears in the manuscript on folio 23v as set out below, and a corrected version is given in cases where the name appears to be recorded erroneously.

From a comparison of this list with the narrative of William of Malmesbury's De Antiquitate, in which many abbots are named on the basis of charter evidence, J. Armitage Robinson deduced that the list was a tenth-century compilation whose author made no use of charters but 'made the best list that he could from names which he read on sepulchral monuments and in the book of commemorations called the Martyrology' (Robinson 1921, p. 33). This judgement seems to be correct. The list cannot have been begun at Glastonbury at an early date and kept up to date thereafter, because the order of names is badly confused.

For example, the name of Berhtwald, who attested king Ine's general grant of privileges in 704 (S245), follows that of Coengils, who was active in the reign of Ine's successor, Æthilheard (S253), and Tunberht, the beneficiary of a charter of 744 (S1410), is represented as the fourth successor of Tyceca, who attests a charter of 757 (S96). Moreover the list is not complete, since a number of men recorded as abbots of Glastonbury are not included in it, for example four eighth-century abbots, Ealdberht, Heahfrith, Guba and Beaduwulf (These men appear in S1253; ECW nos. 377, 632; S1684, ECW, no. 390; S1692, 152).

B.L., Cotton Tiberius B v. fo. 23v.

Hemgils
 Dealhstod
 Coengils
 Beorhtpald
 Cealdhun (Wealdhun)
 Luca (Muca)
 Piccea (Ticcea)
 Bosa
 Stiðheard
 Herefyrð
 Hunbeorht (Tunbeorht)
 Andhun
 Guðlac
 Cuðred
 Ecgwulf
 Dunstan
 Ælfric
 Sigegar
 Æl fpeard

Information about tenth-century abbots of Glastonbury is so scarce that it is impossible to establish at what point, if at any, the list becomes an accurate and complete abbatial list. There is no other record of an Ælfric succeeding Dunstan; the name could be a miscopying of Ælfstan, but the latter is identified as abbot of Glastonbury only in dubious sources. Ælfweard, named here as the successor of Sigegar, who was consecrated to the see of Wells in 975, is not otherwise recorded as abbot of Glastonbury, although an abbot of this name does attest charters at this time (For the evidence concerning tenth-century abbots see Knowles et al. 1972, pp. 50-1) Dr. Dumville argues that the genealogy which precedes the abbatial list in the manuscript must date, in its extant form, from 966 x 971, i.e. between the birth of Eadgar's youngest son, Æthelred (966 at the latest), and the death of his second son, Eadmund (970 or 971), and that the Glastonbury list was probably copied or compiled at the same time, i.e. during the abbacy of Sigegar, the name of Ælfweard being added later (Dumville 1976, p. 43). This dating would also fit the West Saxon regnal list, in which the names are numbered only down to Eadgar, so that Eadweard and Æthelred appear to be additions. It is, of course, quite possible that the abbatial list was first compiled at an earlier date, and that further names were added before it was copied out in the time of Sigegar, but the compilation is not likely to date from earlier than the abbacy of Dunstan.

All the men named in the list down to Dunstan are recorded elsewhere as abbots of Glastonbury except Wealhstod, Bosa, Cuthred and Ecgwulf. In some cases they are known only from William of Malmesbury's account, but, as William was working from charters in the Glastonbury archives, it seems reasonable to accept his information on this point. It cannot be asserted that the four men otherwise unrecorded were not abbots of the house, but it is possible that the first of them is to be identified

with the first holder of the see of Hereford (HE V 23); in a similar abbatial list relating to the monastery at Malmesbury, the second name is Daniel, and this can scarcely be anyone but the bishop of Winchester (See notes on Malmesbury below).

The source material is likely to have been some form of commemorative record, probably either a Liber Vitae, or a necrology. Such a record would provide the compiler with the names of abbots but not the dates of their abbacies, and use of the latter type of record, in which individuals were entered according to their dates of death, could well account for the serious chronological confusion of the list. It appears that Glastonbury possessed such a record since William of Malmesbury made use of it. He lists several archbishops and numerous bishops whom he represents as monks of Glastonbury who were chosen from that community to be bishops elsewhere. In many cases he gives the year and/or day of the month on which the individual died. (DA, pp. 136-8). There can be little doubt that most of these men were never members of the Glastonbury community, but had entered into agreements of confraternity with Glastonbury during their lives and were commemorated there after their deaths. The commemorative record which misled William could also have proved confusing to the compiler of the abbatial list, who may in consequence have included as abbots men who in fact never held that position at Glastonbury.

The abbatial list therefore appears to be a tenth-century compilation containing the names of men commemorated at Glastonbury. Many of these were abbots of the house, but it is far from certain that all were, and some men who did perform the office of abbot are not included. The order is very confused and provides no chronological guide, but the appearance in this list of the name of a man recorded elsewhere as an abbot of Glastonbury may be considered to provide some grounds for confidence in the other record in which he is named.

(b) The Charters

Surviving charters of Glastonbury relating to the period down to 839 are listed below. Dates in brackets are corrected.

S	Date	Donor	Beneficiary
227	670	Coenwalh, king	Berhtwald, abbot
236	681	Baldred, king	Hæmgils, abbot
237	682	Centwine, king	Hæmgils, abbot
1249	(677 or 692)	Hæddi, bishop	Hæmgils, abbot
238	(693)	Ine, king	Hæmgils, abbot
246	704	Ine, king	Glastonbury under abbot Hæmgils
248	(706)	Ine, king	Berhtwald, abbot
247	(706)	Ine, king	Berhtwald, abbot
1253	(718 or 733)	Forthere, bishop	Ealdberht, abbot
250	725	Ine, king	Glastonbury
251	725	Ine, king	Glastonbury
253	729	Æthilheard, king	Glastonbury under abbot Coengils
1410	744	Lulle, nun	Tunberht, abbot
257	745	Cuthred, king	Glastonbury
264	778	Cyniwulf, king	Bica
-	798	Leo III, pope	Cynehelm, king
152	(798)	Coenwulf, king	Cynehelm, king
270a	801	Eadburh, queen	Eadgils

An account of the first charter in the list is placed after the discussion of bishop Hæddi's charter, with which it is connected.

S236

- (1) Longleat House, muniment 10564.
 - (2) Longleat House, manuscript 39, fo. 168r.
- (Edition: B61)

A charter recording a grant of land by 'Baldredus rex' to abbot Hæmgils of Glastonbury survives on a single sheet and in the two manuscripts of the cartulary. The single sheet is of membrane, measuring exactly $8\frac{1}{2}$ inches tall by 8 inches wide; the charter is written on the recto in a single large, clear minuscule hand, with names and attestations distinguished by a different script, and there are various endorsements on the verso; there is no trace of pricking or ruling, but numerous holes are pricked round the edge of the document, perhaps by stitching which has since been unpicked; three horizontal folds and one vertical show that the document was folded in half three times; it is now worn along the horizontal folds and strengthened with sellotape on the verso. The manuscript is considered to date from the tenth century (Robinson 1921, p. 30 n. 2; S236). The only significant difference between the text of the charter on the single sheet and that in the cartularies is that the size of the estate is given in the former as 12 hides and in the latter as 6.

Baldred is almost certainly to be identified with the man of this name who sold an estate to abbot Aldhelm of Malmesbury some time during the reign of Centwine (c. 676-c. 686) (S1170). He is not given the title 'rex' in the Malmesbury charter, but Aldhelm in a letter calls him 'patricius' (Ehwald, p. 503), and the two transactions seem to have taken place at much the same time. The exact date, 681, given in the Glastonbury charter, cannot be relied upon since it is expressed solely as an incarnational year: there is no satisfactory evidence that incarnational dating was used in Anglo-Saxon charters before the eighth century

(The earliest extant original dated in this way is S89 of 736; but cf. Harrison 1976, pp. 52-75), and this date is probably a substitute for an indiction, made by someone who was copying out the charter at a much later date, and who may or may not have calculated it correctly. Moreover, incarnational years in early Glastonbury charters are often demonstrably incorrect. But the date seems to be approximately right, since it fits all the persons mentioned. Abbot Hæmgils was the beneficiary of another grant in 682 and died not later than 704 (S237; abbot Berhtwald attests S245 in 704); bishop Hæddi, whose consent is mentioned, was consecrated during the 670s and died in 705 (The exact date of Hæddi's consecration is uncertain: Bede does not give it, and the Chronicle's date, 676, may not be accurate. See further below under S51, and, for the date of his death, S245); and Aldhelm, who attests with the title 'abbas', was abbot of Malmesbury by 681 and retained that position until 705 (S71; HE V 18).

The extant text of the charter cannot be wholly genuine, since it includes two features which could not have appeared in a seventh-century charter. The first of these is the statement that the grant is made 'ad supplementum honorabilis ecclesie beate Marie et santi Patricii'. The early monastery at Glastonbury was dedicated only to St. Mary, and there is no evidence for the cult of St. Patrick there before the tenth century. The man who drafted this clause was evidently acquainted with the stories of Glastonbury's early connection with St. Patrick, stories which in fact had no foundation (Lapidge 1982a, p. 183 n. 24). The second feature is a boundary clause consisting of a perambulation in Old English. References to boundaries or very brief indications of the limits of estates occur in some of the earliest Anglo-Saxon charters, and have some early continental parallels (See, for example, S8, 1164, 1171. Examples of early continental practice are a private deed

dating from Ravenna c. 600 (Ch. L. A., Part 21, no. 717); and a collection of late fifth-century Vandal deeds (Courtois, Albertini Tablets, *passim*), but detailed perambulations do not appear until the second half of the eighth century, and were then in Latin, Old English bounds being a further development of the ninth century (The development of detailed boundary clauses is discussed more fully in connection with S264 below). This clause must therefore be an interpolation of not earlier than the ninth century.

On the other hand, it does not appear that the text is a total fabrication. The obscure king Baldred would scarcely have been chosen as donor by a forger proposing to draw up an entirely spurious charter, nor is it likely that a forger would have succeeded in choosing names which were all chronologically consistent. Furthermore, the occurrence in the surviving text of early formulas suggests that a genuine early charter, and not merely a note of the fact of Baldred's grant, lies behind this document. The dating clause ends with the word 'feliciter'. This is also the case in two other early West Saxon charters, one in the name of Ceadwalla, king of the West Saxons c.686-688, dated 688, which appears to be a reworking of a genuine charter incorporating authentic elements, one of which is the dating clause (S234); and a charter of king Ine (688-726) which appears to be authentic (S245). The formula does not occur in Anglo-Saxon charters outside Wessex, nor in any later charters, but it is common in Lombard charters and appears in some early Frankish documents, although in the latter the phrase 'in dei nomine feliciter' is more usual (Schiaparelli, Cod. Dip. Longobardo, nos. 7, 12, 16, 18, etc. Of the early Frankish charters printed in facsimile in Ch. L. A., Parts 13 and 14, 'feliciter' occurs in nos. 552, 572, 574, 578, 584, 586, 586; 'in dei nomine feliciter' in nos 565-567, 570, 573, 575-577, 579, 581, 585, 588-591, 593). The evidence suggests

that the earliest West Saxon charters sometimes included this formula, which was derived from the continental, especially Italian, deeds on which Anglo-Saxon charters were modelled, but that the practice was not adopted elsewhere in England and was discontinued in Wessex in the early eighth century.

Another feature of the text resembling continental practice is that the scribe is named: 'Ego Haedde episcopus kartulam scripsi'. It was normal for the scribe of the late Roman private deed to be named, and this practice was continued in continental charters (The practice of the late Roman private deed is exemplified in Gregory's grant of 587 to the monastery of St. Andrew: 'Quam largitatis meae paginam ... Deusdedit viro honesto notario rogatorioque meo scribendam mandavi' (Hartmann, Gregory, p. 438)). Continental practice is shown by the surviving deeds of the Lombards (Schiaparelli, Cod. Dip. Longobardo), the Franks (Ch. L. A. Parts 13 and 14), and the Vandals (Courtois, Albertini Tablets) but not in insular ones: neither the Anglo-Saxon nor the 'Celtic' charter tradition includes scribal attestations or any reference to the person who wrote the document (On the 'Celtic' tradition see Davies 1982. Anglo-Saxon charters do not have scribal attestations except in the cases noted below). But there are four instances, besides Baldred's charter, of English charters in which the scribe is named. One is the record of the proceedings of the Council of Hertford in 672. The relevant formula, 'Quam sententiam definitionis nostrae Titillo notario scribendam confirmaret', is of Italian origin, and has been attributed to the influence of an Italian notary in the service of archbishop Theodore, who presided at the council (HE IV 5; compare the clause quoted above. Chaplais 1965, pp. 49-50). The other three examples are West Saxon. The first is a grant by king Ine's father, Coenred, which dates from the early 670s. The scribe attests at the end of the witness list:

'Ego Uuimbertus presbiter qui hanc cartulam rogante supra effato abbate scripsi et subscripsi'. This wording has Frankish and other continental parallels, and the text includes other Frankish formulas. These details appear to reflect the influence of bishop Leuthere, the second man of Frankish origin to hold the episcopal see of Wessex, who is among the witnesses of the charter (S1164; these points are more fully discussed in connection with that charter in the notes on Shaftesbury below). The same scribe attests in much the same words, 'Ego Winberctus hanc cartam scripsi et subscripsi' in a charter in the name of Ine extant in the Abingdon cartulary, which is spurious but appears to have some basis in an authentic early charter (S239). The third instance is king Centwine's grant to Glastonbury of 682 in which the scribe is said to be Aldhelm: 'Ego Aldhelm hanc scedulam scripsi . et subscripsi' (S237). Since the scribal attestation is worded similarly in each of the four West Saxon charters; the wording in each case resembles Frankish practice; and Hæddi attests one of the charters written by Wynberht while Aldhelm attests the charter written by Hæddi; it seems likely that this group of churchmen were all familiar with, and sometimes followed, the Frankish practice introduced by Leuthere, or possibly by his uncle and predecessor, Agilberht, but that this custom, like the use of 'feliciter', remained in use in Wessex for only a very short time.

A third clause in Baldred's charter may indicate an early exemplar: 'cum consensu ... ceterorum cognatorum gubernacula regni regentium' is not an archaic formula like those discussed above, but seems to reflect the multiple kingship which existed in seventh-century Wessex. A later writer, accustomed to the rule of a single king, and conditioned by Bede and the Chronicle to think in terms of a single king of the West Saxons from the time of Cerdic onwards, would not have been likely to compose this clause. It can be more plausibly attributed to a writer

of Baldred's time (The Chronicle, in spite of presenting a succession of sole rulers as the basic framework of early West Saxon history, does reveal that several men not included in the king-list exercised political power and were given the title of king: ASC s.a. 626 E, 639, 661).

The surviving text, therefore, seems to represent a reworking of a genuine, seventh-century charter, but it is difficult to be certain how thoroughly the text has been revised and which clauses survive from the early charter. The proem bears some resemblance to that of an East Saxon charter of 704 which survives in an eighth-century copy (S65), and may therefore be genuine. The dispositio has evidently been tampered with: 'ob amorem celestis patrie' is unusual and perhaps interpolated; the reference to the dedication of the church is discussed above; there is no objection to the statement of the consent of bishop Hæddi, but the text then goes on 'qui etiam eundem uenerabilem Hæmgilsum Centuine rege Consentiente ibidem abbatem . pro sua fideli conuersatione constituit', and this clause seems unlikely to be genuine: it would have been fairly pointless at the time, and makes more sense considered as an attempt to emphasise the sanctity of Hæmgils after his death; moreover, such references to people's lives are not normally found in authentic charters, but do occur in the work of men writing pseudo-seventh-century documents at a later date, such as the Malmesbury forgery which gives an account of Aldhelm's early life (S1245). It seems likely that what Baldred's charter originally stated at this point was the consent of king Centwine to the grant.

The land is described as situated 'super uerticem montis cuius uocabulum est Pengerd', which is typical of early West Saxon charters in describing the location of an estate by reference to a natural geographical feature. The hideage has been tampered with, as already mentioned, 'sub estimatione . xii/sex . manentium', and the phrase 'sub estimatione',

which occurs in tenth-century charters, may represent rewriting (Eg. the Glastonbury charters S568, 570, 775; see also Brooks 1984, p. 317). Following the bounds are the sanction, dating clause and blessing, which have all probably been rewritten to some extent: 'quod absit' is not usual in early sanctions, an incarnational date has been substituted, probably for an indiction; and the blessing may be wholly interpolated as blessings are not common in early West Saxon charters, and there is no genuine early clause similar in wording to this one. The witness list, consisting of bishop Hæddi, king Baldred and abbot Aldhelm, is unobjectionable but almost certainly abbreviated: it is usual to find that the witness lists of Glastonbury charters are drastically abbreviated in transcripts.

'Pengerd' is now West Pennard, some three miles east of Glastonbury. This estate was apparently distinct from, but adjacent to, that of East Pennard, which is called Pennard Minster in early sources. Both were owned by Glastonbury in 1066, but West Pennard is not named in Domesday Book because it lay within Glastonbury Twelve Hides, the area of specially privileged land around the monastery, and therefore did not need to be specified separately (DB Somerset, p. 8.20; DA, p. 150). West Pennard does not appear in any other pre-Conquest charter, except for a spurious Glastonbury privilege whose details of lands derive from early Glastonbury charters, and the Glastonbury version of Æthelwulf's decimation charter of 854. Both these documents give the size of the estate as 6 hides, as does William of Malmesbury (S250, 303; DA, p. 90). It is not clear whether the estate granted by Baldred was of 6 hides or of 12, nor how the discrepancy in the sources arose. It may be that the amount of land held by the monastery altered between the seventh and tenth centuries in consequence of some informal, unrecorded transaction, and that Baldred's charter was rewritten in order to bring it into line with the new

circumstances, and make it into a valid, up-to-date title deed incorporating the bounds which had been drawn up to define the estate. But it is also possible that a tenth-century scribe, having occasion to write out the document for some other reason, for example because the original was in poor condition, took the opportunity of bringing the text into line with tenth-century conventions of charter-writing. There is no evidence to suggest that the document was altered for any fraudulent purpose; the probability is rather that the rewriting was considered as legitimate modernisation of a charter which was still a valid title-deed for the property concerned.

* * * * *

S237

Longleat House, muniment 10586, pp. 128-9.

(Edition: B62)

A charter recording a grant of land made by king Centwine to abbot Hæmgils survives only in an early sixteenth-century paper register relating to certain Glastonbury estates in Somerset and Wiltshire (Davis 1958, no. 437). The charter was included in the Liber Terrarum (LT 8), but was not among the texts transcribed into the fourteenth-century cartulary. There is no evidence to show in what form it survived until the sixteenth century.

The surviving text resembles that of Baldred's charter in being a revised version of an apparently genuine early instrument. It is dated 682 by indiction and incarnation (MS: 'Dclxxxij . Indiccione . x'; Birch prints DCLXXII by an uncharacteristic blunder (B62); cf. Davidson 1882, p. 91), the latter probably being a later addition but in this case correct, and this date fits all the persons concerned. Centwine,

according to the Chronicle, was king in Wessex from 676 to 686 (ASC s.a. 676, 686). Hæmgils held the abbacy of Glastonbury from at least 681 to 693, and probably longer (S236, 238). The witnesses are bishop Hæddi, Centwine and Aldhelm.

Much of the wording appears genuine. There is no invocation, possibly because a copyist has omitted it. The proem is similar to one in a charter of Ceadwalla in the Malmesbury cartulary (S231). The dispositio is simple and straightforward with no anachronisms except the clause 'ad supplementum uite regularis in monasterio Glastingabirg', which is probably interpolated since the monastery is not usually named in the earliest West Saxon charters. The account of the lands granted by Centwine has been extended by the introduction of a detailed boundary clause which is almost entirely in Latin and was judged by Grundy to date from not later than the ninth century (Grundy 1935, p. 51), but certainly cannot be as early as the seventh century. With this perambulation omitted, the description of the lands is as follows:-

Hoc est uiginti tres mansiones in loco iuxta siluam
famosam que dicitur Cantucuudu . habentes ad austrum
fluuium qui dicitur Tan: ad aquilonem uero silue prefate
partem non modicam ad se trahens ... (bounds) ... Habent
uero ad occasum fontem qui dicitur Ealduuyllle ... (further
bounds) ... Et tres cassatos in australi parte amnis
Tan ad insulam iuxta collem qui dicitur Brectannica
lingua Cructan . apud nos Crycbeorh . et haec pars
telluris eidentissimis^(a) cingitur limitibus . habet
enim ab austro Blacanbroc . ab aquilone Tan.

(a) MS: tellurus eidentissimus.

This passage appears to be authentic. It is typical of early West Saxon charters in that the situation of the lands is stated by reference to natural features, a wood, a river, an island, a hill and a brook. The indication of boundaries by stating the landmarks on one or more of the north, south, east and west sides of an estate derives from late Roman practice and appears in the late fifth-century Albertini Tablets from Vandal Africa, and in other early Anglo-Saxon charters

(Courtloos, Albertini Tablets; S238, 1164). In this case it is probable that the statement of the western boundary, which occurs in the middle of the perambulation, was part of the original description of the estate. Not only does the wording suggest this, but the perambulation, instead of continuing in one direction all round the estate begins by moving clockwise, but breaks off at this point, moves to another place on the boundary, and continues in an anti-clockwise direction (Dickinson 1882, p. 96; Grundy 1938, pp. 104-6). Grundy describes the boundaries as unique in this respect, and the reason for the arrangement appears to be that the description of the boundary was not wholly re-written, but that details were added to an existing account, and the author of these details allowed the arrangement of the original description to dictate the organisation of the new material. The direct reference to boundaries, 'evidentissimis limitibus', also has early parallels, for example the phrase 'iuxta notissimos terminos a me demonstratus et proacuratoribus meis' in the earliest extant original Anglo-Saxon charter (S8; also S1171). The introduction of a British place-name, which was evidently still in common use at the time of writing, also tends to suggest an early date.

The dating clause appears to have been altered by the addition of a year of grace and probably also by the elimination of much of its wording. As it stands, the clause is grammatically part of the passage which follows and which appears to represent later re-writing. It begins by referring to the gift enduring 'quamdiu Cristianitas uigeat'. Expressions of this kind do not occur in early charters; they apparently arose out of fears for the survival of Christendom at the time of the Viking attacks, and appear regularly in later charters. This clause, therefore, can scarcely be earlier than the beginning

of the ninth century. The sanction which follows is unusual in content and includes a provision that a transgressor may escape punishment by making recompense, another feature which is normal in tenth-century charters, but does not occur in early ones. The blessing is also unusual among early charters and its wording is similar to that in Baldred's charter, which is probably interpolated, and terminates with the phrase 'per omnia secula seculorum . Amen' which recalls 'per omnia seculorum' in Baldred's charter. The whole passage following the date in Centwine's charter has apparently been partly, if not entirely, redrafted, and this seems to have been done at much the same time that Baldred's charter was interpolated, possibly by the same hand.

There is no objection to the appearance of bishop Hæddi, king Centwine and abbot Aldhelm as witnesses of the charter. These names presumably represent the surviving portion of a much longer list, abbreviated by a copyist. The attestation forms may have been elaborated: each uses a different verb, 'impressi', 'perstringentis', 'scripsi et subscripsi', recalling episcopal practice in the tenth century, and the second of these is noted by Dr. Nicholas Brooks as a rare word occurring in a series of tenth-century charters, so that its appearance here is suspicious (Brooks 1984, p. 317). The last, however, is likely to be authentic, as discussed above.

The extant text therefore seems to consist of a genuine charter of Centwine into which three passages have been interpolated at a later date, the reference to the monastery of Glastonbury in the dispositio, additional details of the estate boundary, and the passage which follows the date and includes the sanction and blessing. Some re-writing of the dating clause and witness list has apparently taken place, and a genuine sanction was probably discarded in favour of the version

which now survives. Since none of these alterations makes any difference to the substance of the charter, that is the transaction which it records, it is reasonable to deduce that none was introduced with any fraudulent purpose, and the probability is that one or more scribes, engaged in copying out the charter, took the opportunity of improving the text by bringing it into line with the charter-writing customs of their own time, as in the case of Baldred's charter. The possibility of amendment by more than one scribe at different times is suggested by the fact that the bounds appear to be of late eighth- or ninth-century date, while some other details suggest tenth-century work.

Centwine granted two adjacent areas of land. The first consisted of 23 hides next to Quantock Wood. The rubric in the sixteenth-century register identifies this as 'Westmonketone iuxta Tantoniam' and examination of the boundaries confirms that the estate comprised an area around modern West Monkton, about two miles north-east of Taunton. This estate does not recur in Glastonbury records or in any other pre-Conquest charter, but was owned by Glastonbury in 1066 and then assessed at 15 hides (DB Somerset, p. 8.28). The other estate was of 3 hides south of the Tone next to the hill named 'Crycbeorh'. The hill is still named Creechbarrow, and the clear boundaries, the river Tone and the Black Brook, are still there, showing that the estate lay in what is now the eastern part of Taunton. The Celtic 'cruc', meaning a barrow or hill, also survives in Creech St. Michael which lies east of this estate (Grundy 1935, p. 52; Ekwall 1960, p. 129). The land does not recur in Glastonbury records and appears to have passed out of the monastery's possession, or perhaps to have been included within another estate. It is probably not to be identified with the 'Cyrices tun' granted by king Ælfred to a layman in 882 in a charter surviving in the Winchester cartulary (S345; Grundy 1935, pp. 142-9; cf.

PN Worcestershire, p. 107). According to William of Malmesbury, Centwine also granted 20 hides at 'Caric' (DA, p. 90), but this is not mentioned in the surviving charter and is unidentified.

* * * * *

S1249

Longleat House, manuscript 39, fo. 134v.

(Edition: Watkin, Glastonbury Cart., no. 639)

Bishop Hæddi's grant to abbot Hæmgils of lands at Leigh in Street and Meare now survives only in the Great Chartulary and the Secretum Domini, but was extant as a single sheet in 1247 (IC A3) and also apparently in the fourteenth century, since the cartularist does not indicate that he used a copy. The charter seems to be a genuine document, altered only by the introduction of a year of grace and the abbreviation of the witness list to a single name, that of the donor.

The invocation, 'Regnante ac gubernante nos domino nostro Ihesu Christo', is of a type less common in early charters than the various forms beginning 'In nomine ...', but such wordings were certainly in use at an early date, since a similar clause appears in the record of the Synod of Hertford of 672. It may be that the wording derives from the imperial year often cited in Roman documents. Gregory's grant of 587 to the monastery of St. Andrew begins:

In nomine domini dei salvatoris nostri Iesu Christi.
Imperante domno Mauritio Tyberio perpetuo Augusto
anno sexto...

(Hartmann, Gregory, p. 437).

The report of the Synod of Hertford begins:

In nomine domini dei et saluatoris Iesu Christi.
Regnante in perpetuum ac gubernante suam ecclesiam
eodem domino Iesu Christo

(HE IV 5)

Invocations of this type also appear in other early Anglo-Saxon charters which are genuine or have some genuine basis (S64, 95, 105, 259).

The dating clause immediately follows the invocation. This arrangement is not common in Anglo-Saxon charters, but there are a number of early parallels in English and continental documents (Eg. the reports of the Councils of Hertford and Hatfield, HE IV 5, 17; S10, 13, 51, 52, 1168; Hartmann, Gregory, p. 437). The date is given as the 6th July, the 5th indiction, 680. The indiction and the incarnational year are inconsistent, the 5th indiction occurring during Hæddi's episcopate (allowing for his consecration c.675, the exact date being uncertain) in 677 and 692. Nothing in the charter enables it to be closely dated. The text names no-one except Hæddi and Hæmgils, both of whom were certainly active in 692, and may have been active in 677. Either year could be the correct date of the charter.

There follows a proem which states that, since we bring nothing into the world and can take nothing out of it, perishable earthly things should be used to purchase heavenly and eternal ones. This is a common type of proem, deriving from biblical phraseology, but Robinson pointed out that the wording used here in the first clause, 'Nichil intulimus in hunc mundum uerum nec auferre quid possumus', is a very early form of the relevant passage, used by a number of pre-Vulgate authors including St. Cyprian (ob. 258) and St. Paulinus, bishop of Nola (ob. 431), and is prima facie evidence that the charter in which it occurs is of early date (Robinson 1921, pp. 51-2. Robinson is actually discussing S227, in which the same wording occurs, but it will be argued below that that charter is spurious, and that the proem has been borrowed from Hæddi's charter).

The dispositio is of extreme simplicity and brevity, containing no anachronistic or suspicious features, and naming abbot Hæmgils

as beneficiary with no reference to his monastery. There is a brief sanction in two parts, prohibitive clause and penal clause. The inclusion of the former is a feature of some of the earliest Anglo-Saxon charters, but not of later ones (Eg. S231, 235, 238).

A charter drawn up in the name of a churchman or woman commonly includes some indication of royal consent to the transaction, either by explicitly stating this in the dispositio, or by the inclusion of a royal subscription (S1179, 1248, 1254, 1256, 1257, 1260, 1410, 1411, 1412). In Hæddi's charter, and in a few other records of episcopal grants (S1253, 1255, 1262, 1263), there is no reference to royal consent. In theory, this might in each case have been eliminated by a copyist, but it does not seem particularly likely that a copyist would omit a detail calculated to strengthen the authority of the document, and the evidence tends rather to suggest that in the seventh, eighth and early ninth centuries it was possible for a churchperson to grant land without reference to a king.

The land granted by bishop Hæddi consists of 3 hides at 'Lantocal', now Leigh in Street, and 2 hides on an island surrounded by swamps and named 'Ferramere', now Meare, both in Somerset and not far from Glastonbury. In 1066 the island of Meare was still owned and was assessed at 60 acres (DB Somerset, p. 8.1), but Leigh is not mentioned in Domesday Book and did not lie within Glastonbury Twelve Hides, so it had presumably been alienated at some time. This charter is included in the 1247 inventory under the heading of grants to the monastery of lands still owned (IC A3), but this need not indicate that both estates were then held: the compiler's classification did not allow for a charter dealing with two estates of which one was still held and the other was not. These estates do not occur in other pre-Conquest charters except for Glastonbury fabrications whose details

of lands derive from this and other early charters (S227, 250, 783). Glastonbury evidently retained an interest in both estates long enough to include them in forgeries, but there seems no reason to doubt that Hæddi's charter is genuine. The brief and simple wording, the archaisms which it incorporates, the absence of any reference to the monastery and the non-royal donor, who would scarcely have been a forger's choice, are all indications of authenticity.

* * * * *

S227

Longleat House, manuscript 39, fo. 135.

(Edition: Watkin, Glastonbury Cart., no. 644)

A charter surviving in the manuscripts of the cartulary purports to be a grant by king Coenwalh (c.641-c.672) to abbot Berhtwald of Glastonbury of land at 'Ferramere', now Meare, one of the estates granted in bishop Hæddi's charter. This document appears to be a fabrication. Sections of the text agree word for word with portions of two other Glastonbury charters, that of bishop Hæddi discussed above, and another in the name of king Cuthred (740-756) (S1249, 257), and it appears that these clauses have been borrowed by a scribe of later date who wished to draw up an ostensibly seventh-century charter.

The invocation is identical with that of Hæddi's charter and the proem differs only in substituting 'mercanda' for 'comparanda', but the dating clause which is placed between these clauses in the genuine charter is not reproduced, a different dating clause being added at the end of the document. The dispositio begins by agreeing word for word, only substituting different names and a different hideage, before deviating in its account of the land granted:-

- S227: quapropter Ego Cenwalli terram que dicitur Ferramere
unum cassatum Beortwaldo abbati libenter largior necnon ...
- S1249: quapropter . Ego Heddi Episcopus terram qui dicitur
Lantocal . iij . cassatos Hengislo Abbati libenter
largior necnon ...

A sentence confirming the grant largely agrees with a sentence in the charter of Cuthred:-

- S227: 'Coroborauimus nunc crucisque signo confirmato hoc
donatium stabili iure gratum et ratum decerno durare
quamdiu ~~terra~~ uertigo poli terras atque ecora circa
ethera siderum iusso moderamine uoluet.
- S257: sicque proprie manus subscripcione crucisque signo
confirmatum hoc donatium stabili iure gratum et
ratum regum predictorum decerno durare quamdiu
uertigo poli terras atque ecora circa ethera siderum
iusso moderamine uoluet.

Much of the sanction is also paralleled in Cuthred's charter:-

- S227: Si quis autem nusus fuerit huius mee donacionis
testamentum confringere aut adimere conatur,
ipse acrius multatus sit infernalis ergastuli pena
demersus . quam eo demon uel diis dampnatorum
parauit
- S257: Si quis autem huius mee donacionis testamentum nisus
fuerit confringere uel gressum pedis uobis Hengissingum
traditum urbemque glebam extra terminos prefixos uel
definitos limites seu constitutos adimere ipse acrius
multatus sit infernales ertastuli in pena demersus
uiolencieque sue presumptionem luat in eum.

The donor's attestations are almost identical:-

- S227: +Ego Cenwalli basilleos Westsaxon'. proprie manus
subscripcione sancte crucis designauit effugiem ut
nemo qui se regeneratum in Christo nouerit huius
largicionis donum mutare presumat.
- S257: Ego Cuddredus Rex Uest Saxona proprie manus subscripcione
sancte crucis designauit effigiem ut nemo qui se
regnatum in Christo nouerit presumat mutare hanc
donacionem.

J. Armitage Robinson, noticing these parallels, suggested that the text was interpolated but preserved fragments of a genuine charter (Robinson 1921, p. 51). It seems more likely that the document is a total fabrication. The borrowings from two other charters account for a large proportion of the wording, and the remaining

clauses do not resemble genuine seventh-century work. Use of the future tense, 'dabo', was a Kentish practice and is unlikely to appear in a genuine West Saxon charter. The provision that the beneficiary has both a life interest in the property and the right to bequeath it is expressed here in terms very similar to those found in charters of the tenth century, for example one of king Eadwig:-

S227: ut habeat diebus uite sue et post obitum suum
cuicumque uoluerit derelinquat.

S628: ut hoc diebus suis possideat tramitibus uite sue
et post se cuicumque uoluerit heredi derelinquatur.

The dating clause follows the witness list, and the date is expressed solely as an incarnational year, 670.

The donor's attestation is followed by those of four churchmen, archbishop Theodore, bishop Leuthere and abbots Hæddi and Aldhelm. All are famous men whose names could be derived from Bede or the Chronicle, and the last does not fit the date of the charter, since Aldhelm studied for some time with Hadrian, who only came to England in 670, before becoming abbot of Malmesbury (Ehwald, letter II, p. 478; translated by Lapidge and Herren, pp. 153-4; HE IV 1, 2). The subscription form in each case is 'Signum manus', a phrase found in genuine, early West Saxon charters only in the subscriptions of laymen. It is here applied to churchmen by a scribe who was evidently unacquainted with the conventions of seventh-century West Saxon charter writing. The name of the beneficiary, abbot Berhtwald, like that of Aldhelm, does not fit the date, as this man was abbot of Glastonbury after Hæmgils, not before him (S245, 248). The author of this charter chose to introduce Berhtwald's name, instead of copying that of Hæmgils from Hæddi's grant, possibly because the (erroneous) identification of abbot Berhtwald with the archbishop of Canterbury who succeeded Theodore made him a more impressive

choice (DA, p. 90). The witness list suggests the author's desire to enhance his work by using prestigious names, and the donor, Coenwalh, was also a famous figure, prominent in Bede's account of seventh-century Wessex (HE III 7).

This document appears to be the work of a writer of a much later date, probably the tenth century, who drew up the text mainly by borrowing clauses from other charters in the Glastonbury archives, but who also introduced some wording of his own and in doing so used phraseology characteristic of tenth-century writing, while an attempt to imitate the simplicity of early charters resulted in the appearance of anachronistic subscription forms.

The land granted is Meare, but the description in Hæddi's charter, 2 hides in 'Ferramere', is here altered to 1 hide there plus two small islands. William of Malmesbury's account of this charter refers to 2 hides, but John of Glastonbury mentions 1 hide plus two islands and identifies the islands as Westhay and Godney (DA, p. 90; Carley, John of Glastonbury, p. 109). John's descriptions of charters normally derive from and agree with those of William, and the reason for the discrepancy in this case is not clear. William may have noticed the different description of Meare in Hæddi's charter and preferred to quote this, or his description may have been altered by an interpolator.

In spite of the different descriptions in the two charters, it appears that the same estate is meant and that the charter in Coenwalh's name was drawn up to replace that part of Hæddi's charter. No specific reason for this is known, and the community may simply have wished for a more impressive charter, involving one of the famous kings of the conversion period and putting the grant back to an earlier date. Both the Liber Terrarum and William of Malmesbury

attribute to Hæddi only the gift of Leigh, recording Meare as Coenwalh's grant (LT 3, 5, 6; DA, pp. 90, 92). In the case of Hæddi's grant too, the details given by William of Malmesbury do not fit the charter which survives. He dates the grant to 681, quotes the area of land as 6 hides and mentions the consent of Centwine and Baldred and the subscription of Ceadwalla. It seems that in this case William saw a different charter, and the existence of another version is confirmed by the contents list of the Liber Terrarum whose fifth entry reads 'Hedda episcopus de Lantokay, i. Leghe, dat. Glast. II'. Since the charter immediately following is recorded as seventh in the landboc (S236; an endorsement on the verso reads 'Carta Baldredi regis de Pennard et est septum in landebok'), it appears that the numeral 'II' is intended to indicate that there were two charters recording Hæddi's grant of Leigh, and, as the compiler would hardly have copied out the same charter twice in succession, it is to be presumed that there existed two different versions. The evidence suggests that when the new charter for Meare was drafted a new charter for Leigh was also produced, but that the original charter was not discarded. The compiler of the Liber Terrarum transcribed all three (LT 3, 5, 6). William of Malmesbury preferred to use the more prestigious versions and disregarded the original charter which they superseded. The compiler of the 1247 inventory listed only the original charter, which indicates that it was the only one of the three extant as a single sheet at that date (IC A3). Similarly, the fourteenth-century cartularist transcribed the original text because he worked from single sheets where possible, ignored the other charter in Hæddi's name, presumably because it appeared superfluous, and transcribed the charter in Coenwalh's name 'per copiam'. Consequently it is these two texts which survive, the one a genuine charter and the

other a fabrication.

The latter is of no value except that it incorporates a list of the component parts of the estate which is very different from other such lists and reads like an accurate account of the area by a man who knew it. The land was granted 'cum captura piscium in utraque parte stagni cum paludibus siluis pascuis apium et omnibus ad se pertinentibus'. This gives a vivid picture of the sort of land which surrounded Glastonbury and the use which was made of it: fisheries, marshes which probably furnished reeds for thatching (Cf. HE III 25), woods and bee pastures. Domesday Book's account of the same estate involves meadows, arable land, vineyards and livestock (DB Somerset, p. 8.1), indicating more normal agricultural uses, and suggesting that by the eleventh century some progress had been made in the drainage and cultivation of the area.

* * * * *

S238

Longleat House, manuscript 39, fos. 180v-181.

(Edition: Glastonbury Cart., no. 979)

The earliest charter of king Ine (688-726) to survive in the archive of Glastonbury is preserved in the manuscripts of the cartulary and records the king's confirmation of a grant of land made earlier by Baldred to abbot Hæmgils at the request of a layman, 'per petitionem Serdheris'; the correct form of this name is not clear, and the man is unknown. The sequence of events is quite plausible, as similar cases are recorded. Baldred's grant to abbot Hæmgils made at the request of a layman may be compared with a grant of Æthilred, king of the Mercians (c.675-704) to abbot Aldhelm of Malmesbury, made

at the request of Coenfrith (S91), and another grant of Baldred was confirmed by another king at a later date (S1170; see discussion in the notes on Malmesbury below). The witness list has been abbreviated to a single name, that of bishop Hæddi, and there follows an endorsement recording the later confirmation of king Æthilbald of Mercia (716-757). The charter seems to be substantially genuine.

The dating clause is placed after the invocation at the beginning of the charter, an arrangement noted above as an early practice. The dates given are AD 663, 6th indiction, 20th July. The incarnational date is probably an interpolation and has been either miscalculated or miscopied: the only 6th indiction falling within Ine's reign and Hæddi's episcopate was 693. Baldred is said to have consented to Ine's confirmatory grant, and there is no obstacle to the belief that he was still active at this date, nor need it be doubted that Hæmgils still held the abbacy of Glastonbury.

The wording of the charter has every appearance of authenticity. The invocation is a simple version of the common 'In nomine ...' type. The text is dated to the exact day as well as the month and indiction, as is the case in Hæddi's charter and in other early texts (Eg. Synod of Hertford, HE IV 5; S10, 13, 51, 245, 1169). The king's title is given as 'rex Saxonum', as is usual in seventh- and early eighth-century West Saxon royal charters (S235, 237, 238, 240, 243, 244), and the dispositio is simple and short with no anachronisms, only being slightly unusual among West Saxon charters in using the present tense rather than the past. The reference to Hæddi's advice, 'cum pontificis nostri consilio' resembles that in another charter of Ine, 'cum consilio et decreto presulis nostri (S245). The beneficiary is abbot Hæmgils and the monastery is not mentioned. The sanction includes a brief prohibitive clause, 'ut nullus infringere audeat'

as well as a penal clause in the usual form, 'si quis ... sciat se rationem domino redditurum'.

The estate is described as situated on and around a hill, and the text goes on to give boundaries. These are in Latin and of the simplest possible kind, naming the landmarks on the four sides of the estate, 'habens ab occidente Sabrinam . ab aquilone Axam . ab oriente Ternuc . ab austro Siger'. The wording resembles that of Centwine's charter, and it is argued above that such bounds are likely to be genuine. 'Ternuc' is now represented by the modern village of Tarnock. The name 'Siger' does not survive. The hill is named in the charter as 'Brente', and it appears that the 10 hides of land granted lay at Brent Knoll and probably included East Brent (Grundy 1935, pp. 149-50). In 1066 Glastonbury owned an estate assessed at 20 hides and named 'Brentemerse' (DB Somerset, p. 8.33). Every Glastonbury record of charters or lands attributes to Ine the grant of either 10 hides at 'Brente' or 20 hides at 'Brentemerse'. William of Malmesbury's narrative, the 1247 inventory of single sheets and the fourteenth-century cartularist, apparently working from a single sheet, all mention 10 hides at 'Brente' (DA, p. 92; IC A4; Longleat House, manuscript 39, fos. 180v-181). The Liber Terrarum, William of Malmesbury's summary of Glastonbury's possessions (which appears to be either interpolated or derived from a source later than the charters used for his narrative) and Domesday Book all quote 20 hides at 'Brentemerse' or 'Brentemaraire' (LT 20; DA, p. 140; DB Somerset, p. 8.33). Since each record mentions one estate or the other, but not both, it seems that there are two versions of one grant, not two distinct grants of two estates, and that 'Brentemaraire' is to be identified with 'Brente'. This is confirmed by William of Malmesbury who mentions 'Brentacnolle qui nunc Brentamirre dicitur' (DA, p. 84). It appears that the name changed and that a further 10 hides came into Glastonbury's possession at some time, so some Glastonbury records

were altered to fit the new circumstances. We are indebted to the cartularist's practice of working from single sheets for the preservation of the text as it was written in the seventh century.

Hæddi's subscription is followed by a clause introducing three attestations added to confirm the grant at a later date:

*'hec enim sunt nomina testium subrogatum posterioris
temporis pro maioris munimine firmamenti.'*

This reads rather like a cartularist's rubric, although nothing in the layout of the surviving fourteenth-century manuscript indicates this.

The subscriptions which follow are:-

*'+Ego Baldredus Rex + Ego Athelbaldus Rex + Ego
Herewaldus speculator ecclesie dei cum multis
aliis.'*

A detailed sanction and blessing are added.

There is nothing implausible in the concept of a later confirmation added to an early Glastonbury charter by Æthilbald of Mercia. He confirms another grant to Glastonbury and is also recorded as a benefactor of the house (S1410, 1679). Herewald was bishop of Sherborne, and succeeded to that see not earlier than 739 when his predecessor, Forthere, was still active (S255). It is virtually impossible that Baldred was still alive at this time, and his name has perhaps been misplaced: he could well have appeared in the original witness list. The wordings of the sanction and blessing are similar to those in a group of charters dating from 725-745, and appear to be genuine (S251, 253, 256, 257, 1410; the wording of Æthilbald's endorsement is more fully discussed in connection with the wordings of these charters below). The indications are that an authentic confirmation in the name of Æthilbald of Mercia was added to this charter some time between 739 and 757. Of this there survive an abbreviated and interpolated witness list and a sanction and blessing, plus an introductory clause which is perhaps the cartularist's rubric. The charter to which this endorsement is appended also seems to be authentic.

The wording has no anachronisms other than the incorrect incarnational year, which could easily be introduced in the course of copying a genuine text. The account of Baldred's earlier grant would scarcely have been invented by a forger, nor would a forger have used an obsolete place-name and cited a hideage only half that owned in later years.

An assertion in the De Antiquitate that Hæmgils' successor, abbot Berhtwald, voluntarily alienated the estate at Brent Knoll is apparently connected with the erroneous identification of the abbot with Berhtwald, archbishop of Canterbury (593-731), and cannot be assumed to have any basis in fact. It may have been interpolated into William of Malmesbury's narrative (DA, pp. 90, 92, 197 n. 80, 198, n. 85).

* * * * *

S246

Longleat House, manuscript 39, fo. 58v.

(Edition: Glastonbury Cart., no. 200)

There survives in the archive of Malmesbury a charter dated 704 in which Ine granted privileges to all the churches and monasteries of his kingdom (S245). Most of the wording of this Glastonbury charter, which is extant in cartulary copies, agrees word for word with the Malmesbury text, and it appears that the two versions derive from copies of the same document, kept in different archives, probably following a distribution of copies to all interested houses at the time of the grant. The text is fully discussed in the notes on the Malmesbury archive below.

There is reason to believe that all copies were originally expressed as grants to all the religious houses of Wessex, and that the Glastonbury version, which is worded as a grant to Glastonbury alone, was altered in this way at a much later date. Firstly the text refers to St. Patrick

as one of the patron saints of Glastonbury, which must indicate later interpolation, as already noticed. Secondly, the abbot of Glastonbury is incorrectly named as Hæmgils: the witness list of the Malmesbury text includes abbot Berhtwald, who was probably Hæmgils' immediate successor. Thirdly, the Liber Terrarum included two documents which seem to have been copies of the charter worded as a grant to all churches, as in the extant Malmesbury text. The second and 135th items in the contents list are 'Carta Ynæ de libertatibus concessis ecclesiæ in Westsaxonia' and 'Privilegium Ynæ concessum generaliter omnibus ecclesiis'. The probability is that both these entries relate to the grant of 704: it is not uncommon to find a single charter transcribed twice in the same manuscript.

It therefore appears that Glastonbury retained an unamended copy of the charter at least down to the late tenth century, and that the revised version was produced some time after the compilation of the Liber Terrarum and before William of Malmesbury wrote the De Antiquitate, in which the charter is transcribed in its amended form (DA, pp. 92-4). The interpolator also simplified the dating clause by omitting all details of date except the incarnational year, and substituting 'in lignea basilica' for the place where the grant was made (Cf. S257, 966). The witness list is abbreviated to a single name in some manuscripts, and omitted altogether in others.

The Glastonbury version of Ine's charter is important in that it furnished independent evidence supporting the theory that the Malmesbury text is genuine; it suggests that as early as the beginning of the eighth century it was customary for copies of a charter recording a grant to more than one beneficiary to be made for the archives of each of the interested establishments; and it provides reasonably clear evidence that a Glastonbury charter containing anachronistic details

may be an authentic document which has been interpolated, rather than a fabrication, as has been suggested above in connection with the charters of Baldred and Centwine.

* * * * *

S248

Manuscript DD/SAS PR 501, Somerset Record Office, Taunton.

(Edition: B113)

A charter in which Ine grants a number of estates to abbot Berhtwald survives only on a single sheet which is the property of the Somersetshire Archaeological and Natural History Society, and is held at the Somerset Record Office in Taunton. It was given to the Society by the Rev. Hill Sawe Wickham (c.1807-1874), but there survives no record of where he acquired the document, and its provenance before the nineteenth century is unknown (I am indebted to Mr. D.M.M. Shorrocks, the Somerset County Archivist, for this information. The manuscript is not mentioned in the annual accounts of additions to the Taunton Museum, where it was formerly held, in the Proceedings of the Somersetshire Archaeological and Natural History Society, and J.B. Davidson, in his discussion of 1884, gives no account of the provenance of the document). It was not included in the Liber Terrarum, the 1247 inventory of single sheets, or the fourteenth-century cartulary, and there is no direct reference to the document in any Glastonbury record, although William of Malmesbury credited Ine with the gift of all the estates concerned, interspersing these lands with others in his account (DA, p. 94). A version of the charter drawn up to relate to only one of the estates was extant as a single sheet in 1247 (IC A5) and is transcribed in the cartulary (S247).

The charter is written on the flesh side of a sheet of whitish

membrane measuring 15 $\frac{3}{4}$ inches wide by 7 $\frac{1}{4}$ inches tall, with margins of $\frac{3}{4}$ inch at the top, 2 $\frac{1}{4}$ inches at the bottom, 1 inch on the left and 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ inches on the right. The verso has been stuck on to a piece of thin but stiff fabric, probably canvas. There are three equidistant vertical folds. The outer ones now appear only as faint lines on the membrane, and there is no trace of them on the canvas backing, but the document has been folded in the centre since it was mounted on the canvas, and the membrane is badly cracked along the fold and appears dry and crumbly. It is in a similar condition in the bottom right-hand corner where the backing has peeled off. There are dark blotches, evidently the result of past damage by damp, which do not significantly obscure the text, but a few letters on the central fold are illegible.

The text is written in a single minuscule hand, including attestations. The witnesses are arranged in two columns of four, with the ninth subscription added to the right of the second column. The text begins with a cross, and the first word is in capitals, but there is no other ornamentation. On the verso two endorsements can be seen through the canvas backing; one can be read as 'Carta Ine regis'; the other is in lighter ink and more difficult to see, but it may read 'Iny carta'.

Professor I. Julian Brown suggests that the manuscript may be a facsimile produced by a scribe of a much later date, possibly the sixteenth century, who had an early West Saxon exemplar (I should like to thank Professor Brown for looking at the facsimile (O. S. Facs., Vol. 2, Taunton) on my behalf, and providing the palaeographical information which is here set out); The script of the charter incorporates letter forms characteristic of early insular writing. These include the long l with small following letter; the emphatic, tapering cross-bar of t; the long g, especially in augere (line 6), where the head of the letter is all to the left of the stem; the p with its final stroke

turned up, for example in propter (line 2); an occasional a with a tall head, as in abbati (line 3); the dropped i after c, e and t, and the ligatures of ec, eg, em, er, et, ex and est.

Similarities can be found in genuinely early manuscripts of south-western origin, for example those having glosses written by Boniface and another West Saxon scribe (Facsimiles: Parke\$ 1976, between pp. 168 and 169), and the fragment of Servius' commentary on the Aeneid, judged by Lowe to have been written in south-west England during the first half of the eighth century (Now in the Pfarrbibliothek, Spangenberg; facsimile: Cod. L.A., Supplement, no. 1806); also the ninth-century hand of manuscript 3, and the Wilton witness list of manuscript 1, of the agreement between the West Saxon kings and archbishop Ceolnoth at the Council of Kingston in 838 (S1438; facsimiles: B.M. Facs., Vol. 2, no. 27; Vol. 1, no. 17), which recurs in king Æthelwulf's grant to himself of 847 (S298, facsimile: B M. Facs., Vol. 2, no. 30), and in a book now in the Bodleian (Facsimile: Cod. L.A., no. 234). Not altogether dissimilar is the Cornish hand of the first scribe of the Berne Gospels (Manuscript 671, Stadbibliothek, Berne; facsimile: Lindsay 1912, plate IV), and another specimen which exhibits the long l and the long cross-bar on the t is the Junilius fragment written in a southern centre in the eighth century (British Library, Tiberius A xv; facsimile: Cod. L.A., Vol. 2, no. 189), which has something in common with the writing of the original letter of bishop Wealdhere of London, which dates from 704-5 (Facsimile: Chaplais 1978, pp. XIV 6/7).

But there are also features of the extant manuscript which are inconsistent with an early date. Four letters in particular suggest that this copy may well have been made as late as the sixteenth century. The final stroke in h, m, n and u ends in a hairline rising to the right, as if to form a link with a following letter; but in genuine, early

insular script no such link was permitted. If the final strokes of h, m and n were not plain (either blunt or pointed), they descended below the base-line and turned to the left, not to the right. The final stroke of u was invariably plain, in order to avoid confusion with the open form of a, which did end in a rising hair line on the right. The copyist avoided this set of errors for the first few words of line 1 only. Again, the first strokes of m and n and both strokes of u are wedged in early insular script; but in the copy the first stroke of each letter has no more than a hairline approach stroke and the second stroke of u is left plain. The scripts of the endorsements have a late medieval appearance, the first tending to suggest a fourteenth- or fifteenth-century date, the second possibly fifteenth-century. But the scribe who facsimiled the text on the recto may also have made facsimiles of the endorsements, so that the appearance of the scripts cannot be considered evidence of the date of the manuscript.

Another example of a manuscript facsimile by a post-medieval copyist is Sir Christopher Hatton's Book of Seals. In this collection of seventeenth-century charter transcriptions nearly half are facsimiles (Loyd and Stenton 1950). The person who copied Ine's charter was less skilled, but did succeed in reproducing the letter-forms of his exemplar well enough to make it fairly certain that that exemplar was an eighth-century manuscript. The inclusion in the text of an incarnational date which is inconsistent with the indiction, 705 for recte 706, tends to imply that it was a copy and not the original, although it is perhaps not outside the bounds of possibility that an original of 706 included an incarnational year and that this was miscalculated, or misread by a scribe who consulted a Dionysiac table (On the possibility that incarnational dating was known and used in England before the end of the seventh century, see Harrison 1976, pp. 52-75). It is also possible that the exemplar was the original, and included the correct year, 706, and that this

was misread by the scribe of the surviving manuscript. But whether the exemplar was the original or a copy, its apparently early date establishes a strong presumption of the authenticity of the charter.

It is a curious feature of the manuscript that the attestations bear some traces of individuality. Many of the crosses introducing the attestations are obscured by the damage to the manuscript, but those that can be seen have different forms, some with wedges at the ends of the strokes, and some without. The word 'episcopus' is usually abbreviated as 'ep̄', but in one instance is written 'ep̄s' and in another 'ep̄ī'. The word 'subscripsi' appears in each of the nine attestations, and is presented in a variety of abbreviations, with differing abbreviation marks and two distinct forms of the letter s. It is scarcely possible, however, to infer that the witnesses personally wrote their subscriptions, since autograph witness lists are unknown in extant original Anglo-Saxon charters, and these details probably indicate only scribal vagaries in the exemplar. They are not entirely without parallel. In the witness list of manuscript 1 of the report of the Council of Kingston in 838 (S1438) there are eleven attestations in the form 'signum manus', of which ten are written with a rounded s and one with a tall s; and a Hwiccian original of 759 has the two forms of s used interchangeably in the repeated phrase 'consensi et subscripsi' (S56).

The text of the charter shows every sign of authenticity. The invocation is the one used in Gregory's charter for the monastery of St. Andrew in 587 and other late Roman documents, and which also occurs in a number of the earliest surviving English charters (Stevenson 1914, p. 702). The proem (S65, 1164, 1169, 1248), the king's title, 'regnante domino rex' (S231, 245), the sanction (S238, 245, 1169, 1170, 1176), and the blessing (S65, 1248, 71) are all similar in wording to clauses in other authentic early charters. Other features common in early texts

are the words 'cyrograph' and 'singrapha' (S71, 235, 245, 1248), the absence of any reference to the monastery ruled by the abbot who is named as the beneficiary (S238, 1249), and the granting of several areas of land in a single charter (S243, 1164, 1249).

The document is dated the 4th indiction, the month of June, 705. The 4th indiction occurred during Ine's reign in 691, 706 and 721. Since Aldhelm attests here as bishop, and held the see of Sherborne from 705 to 709, the correct date of the charter is apparently 706, as noted above. The beneficiary, Berhtwald, was abbot of Glastonbury from 704 to 709 and probably longer (He witnessed S245 of 704 and is mentioned in a letter to bishop Forthere of Sherborne, who was consecrated in 709: Tangl, no. 7). The witness list appears to derive from a national synod, since it consists of the attestations of the archbishop of Canterbury and eight bishops. No layman subscribes, not even the donor. The names are:-

Berhtwald, archbishop (of Canterbury)

Headda, bishop (of Lichfield)

Acca, bishop (of Dunwich)

Tyrctil, bishop (of Hereford)

Wealdhere, bishop (of London)

Ecgwine, bishop (of Worcester)

Elwine, bishop (? of Mercia)

Aldhelm, bishop (of Sherborne)

Daniel, bishop (of Winchester).

It can be established with certainty in some cases, and with reasonable probability in others, that the episcopates of these men included the date of the charter. Berhtwald was consecrated in 693 and died in 731 (HE v 8; v 23). Headda is included in the witness lists of two authentic charters pre-dating this one: a grant of Oshere of the Hwicce to an

abbess named Cuthswith which is undated but certainly earlier than Ine's charter since its witnesses include bishop Oftfor, predecessor of Ecgwine of Worcester; and the grant made to bishop Wealdhere by Swæfred of Essex and Pæogthath in 704. He also appears in a witness list which is appended to a ninth-century Kentish forgery but which itself appears to be genuine: it includes a complete list of southern bishops plus Acca of Hexham, and could scarcely have been drawn up by a forger. The text ascribes the list to the Synod of Clofesho in 716, possibly erroneously since the charter is itself spurious, but the witness list also includes Aldhelm's successor, Forthere, and cannot therefore be earlier than 709 (S53; S65; S22; on the last, see Brooks 1984, pp. 191-7). Acca of Dunwich was one of the two East Anglian bishops consecrated to replace bishop Bisi when he was prevented from carrying out his duties by ill-health; the date of the consecration is unknown, but it was after 672, in which year Bisi attended the Synod of Hertford. Acca attests three Evesham charters; all three are spurious, but their authors appear to have made use of at least one authentic witness list of 705 x 709 (HE IV 5; S79, 81, 1175).

Tyrctil of Hereford is among the witnesses of a grant made to the monastery of Barking by bishop Eorcenwald of London (S1248), and is recorded as making a grant of land to Eorcenwald's successor, Wealdhere, some time during the reign of king Coenred of Mercia (704-709) (S1785). There is ample evidence for Wealdhere in the years preceding Ine's charter: he had succeeded Eorcenwald by c.694 according to Bede; he is the beneficiary of two other grants besides those of Tyrctil and of Swæfred and Pæogthath mentioned above; and his letter to archbishop Berhtwald of 704 x 705 survives in its original form. He does not appear in any record relating to the period after 706 (HE IV 11; S1783, 1784; Chaplais 1978). Ecgwine of Worcester attests a Hwiccan charter of 704 x 709

(S1177), and was still bishop of the see when Æthilbald became king of the Mercians in 716 (S102).

'Eluvinus' is probably to be identified with Ealdwine, also called Worr, who succeeded Headda as bishop of Lichfield. Confirmatory evidence for their joint tenure of the see appears in the witness list mentioned above as ostensibly deriving from the Council of Clofesho of 716, since both Headda and Worr are included in it. There had been two bishops of Mercia in the recent past during Wilfrid's sojourn there, and were to be two again in the near future when the see of Leicester was founded, so there is no insurmountable objection to the theory that two Mercian bishops attested this charter (Page 1966, p. 5; HE V 23 and Colgrave, Wilfrid, ch. XLV, p. 92; Historia Regum, s.a. 737). Aldhelm and Daniel were consecrated in 705; the former died in 709, the latter survived until c.745 (HE V 18; ASC sa 745).

The archbishop's subscription is in the form 'Ego consentiens subscripsi', identical with the clerical subscriptions in Ine's general grant of privileges of 704 (S245). The bishops all attest with the words 'Ego subscripsi', except for Daniel, whose attestation is distinct in wording as in position: 'Ego Daniel . plebi . dei ministrans . subscripsi'. The resemblance of this subscription to the characteristic humility formula 'plebis dei famulus' which occurs in Daniel's letters and in other charters (Tangl, nos. 23, 39, 64; S253, 256) suggests that Daniel personally wrote or dictated it, and it may be that he drew up the witness list of this charter.

Ine granted to abbot Berhtwald a total of 65 hides of land in four places:-

- 20 hides next to the river called 'Tan';
- 20 hides in the place called 'Pouelt';
- 20 hides on either side of the river

'Duluting', stretching as far as the valley
of 'Corregescumb';

5 hides on the west side of that valley.

It has been suggested that the first estate, on the river Tone in Somerset, is to be identified with West Monkton, described in Centwine's charter as 'habentes ad austrum fluvium qui dicitur Tan' (Dickinson 1882, p. 92 n. 3). Centwine granted 23 hides, not 20, but there might have been problems concerning the estate, possibly during Ceadwalla's takeover of power in Wessex c.686-688, involving the need for a regrant or confirmation of possession, and resulting in a change in the area of the estate. It is apparent, however, that in later years the community regarded Centwine's charter as their effective title-deed for West Monkton, since this document survives in a revised version incorporating the boundaries of the estate. And in the absence of boundaries or any more detailed account of the estate in Ine's charter, it is impossible to be certain of the identification. The estate may have been on another stretch of the river, which rises north-west of Wiveliscombe and passes near to Wellington and through Taunton before joining the Parrett near Athelney. William of Malmesbury refers to the river as the 'Tamer' and may have believed it to be the Tamar (DA, p. 94). Later writers call the place 'Linis', also occurring as 'Lining' and 'Livig', but this place-name is unidentified (DA, pp. 94 n. 2, 140; Carley, John of Glastonbury, p. 48).

The second area of land, also of 20 hides, at 'Pouelt' is perhaps to be identified with the 'Poholt' recorded as a grant of kings Æthilheard (726-740) and Sigiberht (756-7) (S253, 1680). The identification is not made by either William of Malmesbury or John of Glastonbury in whose accounts the name of the estate, which was evidently unfamiliar, is misrepresented as 'Bouelt' and 'Rouelt' (DA, pp. 94, 140; Carley,

John of Glastonbury, p. 48). But the names are sufficiently alike to make it probable, and it has been accepted by modern scholars (ECW, no. 371; S248; DA, p. 95). The other grants have different hideages and suggest some reorganisation of estates in the area and the need for confirmation of Glastonbury's possession, but it remains difficult to account for grants of 20 hides in 706, 60 in 729 and 22 (plus 6 purchased) in 756. The evidence suggests that the land granted by Ine was retained, but that this charter was superseded by other title-deeds.

The charter grants a further estate of 20 hides described as land on either side of the river 'Duluting' extending as far as the valley which is called 'Corregescumb'. The river is now called the Sheppey, but the name Doultin survives in a village about a mile east of Shepton Mallet. The name 'Corregescumb' also survives in the village of Croscombe, but it is not clear where the valley of this name lay, as the charter description makes it clear that this is distinct from the valley of the Sheppey in which modern Croscombe is situated. Another version of this charter, already mentioned, was drawn up to relate to this estate alone, and has detailed Old English bounds which have enabled the estate to be identified as an area comprising Pilton, Croscombe and Shepton Mallet (Grundy 1953, p. 79). In 1066 Glastonbury owned a manor of 20 hides at 'Doltin', which is probably this estate, although 20 hides at Pilton were also owned (DB Somerset, pp. 8.23, 8.20), and this could be the estate in question, or include part of it. It seems that the land was retained.

The 5 hides on the west side of the valley of 'Corregescumb' have been tentatively identified with the 5 hides at North Wootton which are mentioned as the grant of various kings in various Glastonbury records (Davidson 1884, p. 12; S248; S509; S1684, 1700). This may be right, but the charter description does not admit of certainty. If it is correct,

the estate was retained but the gift attributed to other kings.

The evidence suggests that this charter was effectively, if not physically, discarded by the Glastonbury community in favour of the version relating only to the third estate, which implies that it was of no value as a title-deed for the other three areas. It may be that some or all of these other lands passed out of Glastonbury's possession, and the charter with them, which would account for its absence from other Glastonbury records. Or it may be that the possible identifications of the estates mentioned above are correct; that the charter remained at Glastonbury but was superseded by other documentation and therefore valueless, so that there was no reason to amend it in any way at any later date; and that this is why the text apparently survives virtually as it was written in 706. Hæddi's grant to abbot Hæmgils may be compared: it appears that revised versions were drawn up, but that the original was not immediately discarded, so that its text now survives largely unamended.

There seems to be little doubt of the authenticity of Ine's charter. There are no anachronisms in the wording, except the erroneous incarnational date; the witness list could scarcely have been forged, and all persons involved seem to have been active in 706; the terms in which the lands are described are typical of early charters in that they refer chiefly to rivers and other natural features, and are not what a forger would have been likely to use; a forger would not have omitted the name of the monastery; and it appears that the person who wrote the surviving copy of the charter used an early exemplar, probably dating from the eighth century, and perhaps the original.

* * * * *

S247

Longleat House, manuscript 39, fos. 155, 161.

(Edition: Watkin, Glastonbury Cart., no. 774)

The charter mentioned above as a revised version of Ine's grant survives in cartulary copies. It is transcribed twice in each manuscript of the cartulary, probably by an oversight on the part of the cartularist, as the transcripts do not differ except in a few details. In the first, apparently taken from a single sheet which was presumably the one listed in 1247 (IC A5), the date is given only as the year of grace 705, and there are two attestations, '+Ego Iny signaui salutifero signo . + Ego Byarctwlad (sic) archiepiscopus signaui'. In the second, headed 'Dat. per copiam', the dating clause includes the 4th indiction and the month of June, as in the surviving single-sheet charter discussed above, but the incarnational year is 702, probably because DCCu has been misread as DCCii; there is a third attestation, that of bishop Headda (of Lichfield); and many words in the Old English boundary clause are spelled differently.

More significant are the differences between this version of the charter and that on the single sheet. In the cartulary version the name of Berhtwald's monastery is specified, 'ad sanctum monasterium Glastyngaburgh'; a set of detailed Old English bounds is provided in respect of the 20 hides on the river 'Doultying' and the other three estates are omitted; the wordings of the blessing and sanction are slightly different; and the witness list is amended and abbreviated and the date cited differently as detailed above.

It seems fairly certain that this is the later, revised version of the charter, while the version on the extant single sheet represents the text as it was first drawn up. A later writer would add, not omit, the name of the monastery; the bounds can scarcely be earlier than the ninth century; and the form of the subscriptions does not resemble

early practice and appears to represent re-writing.

It may be that this version of the charter was produced because the community required a title-deed relating solely to the estate on the river Sheppey. According to William of Malmesbury, the ownership of 'Dulting' was transferred from the abbot of Glastonbury to the community in 851, and William also records that king Eadred restored this and another estate to Glastonbury following an earlier alienation (DA, pp. 112, 118). The text might have been drawn up in connection with one of these transactions, or it may simply represent Ine's charter brought up to date at a time when changes in the names, organisation or ownership of the other estates had rendered the original version obsolete. The text does not claim anything which was not granted in Ine's charter, and cannot be regarded as a forgery, although the name of the monastery and the attestation of the donor have been introduced, probably to strengthen the authority of the document.

The evidence relating to the charter indicates that a monastic community might copy out a charter on several different occasions over the years, and might introduce alterations in the text each time in order to improve or bring up to date a record which was still a valid legal document. It is apparent that there existed, before the fourteenth-century cartulary was compiled, a single-sheet copy of Ine's charter relating only to the estate on the Sheppey, and a cartulary copy which was slightly different, as well as the original, or a copy, of the charter as it was first drafted. It is probable that a number of different copies were made in many other cases where there does not survive such clear evidence for them, and that the introduction of minor alterations by successive copyists accounts for the anachronistic details found in the surviving texts of many charters which appear to be basically authentic.

* * * * *

S1253

Longleat House, manuscript 39, fo. 134v.

(Edition: Watkin, Glastonbury Cart., no. 640)

A very brief charter recording a grant by 'Fortere famulus famulorum dei', now survives only in the manuscripts of the cartulary, but a single sheet was extant in 1247 (IC A18), and the scribe of the Great Chartulary probably worked from a single sheet as he does not indicate otherwise. However, it does not appear likely that the single sheet could have been the original, as the text is so brief as to suggest that it has been abbreviated by a copyist, and, as there is no reason to suppose that the fourteenth-century cartularist made a practice of curtailing charters, except possibly in respect of witnesses, this must have been the work of an earlier scribe.

The text which survives, however, seems to be based on an authentic charter. The donor is presumably the man who succeeded Aldhelm as bishop of Sherborne in 709, accompanied queen Frithugyth to Rome in 737 and was still active in 739 (HE V 9; ASC s.a. 737; S255). The text is dated 712, the first indication, and these are not consistent, so the incarnational date is probably a later addition and miscalculated, as seems to be common in Glastonbury charters. The first indiction occurred during Forthere's episcopate in 718 and 733, and neither date can be confidently ruled out. The grant is made to an abbot named Ealdberht, who is otherwise unrecorded: he is not in the abbatial list; he is named in no other charter; and his appearance in the 1247 inventory as the beneficiary of four other charters is merely a careless error (IC A16-20: one of these charters is of much later date, a grant of Æthelred II to abbot Berhtred (S1775); another is Lulle's grant of 744 to abbot Tunberht (S1410); and the other two are seventh-century grants by king Centwine and bishop Wilfrid (S1668, 1675). It appears

that Ealdberht's name in the inventory derives solely from Forthere's charter). An abbot named Coengils is recorded as ruling the monastery in the reign of Æthilheard, but the exact dates of his abbacy are unknown (S253). It is therefore impossible to be certain whether Ealdberht was a predecessor of Coengils and received Forthere's grant in 718, or whether he succeeded Coengils some time after 726, in which case Forthere's charter would date from 733. No other person is named in the charter, and the witness list has been abbreviated to a single attestation, that of the donor, so there is no evidence to show which is the correct date.

The charter is unusual in that the estate is said to become the personal property of the abbot, who may dispose of it as he wishes, '*in propriam substantiam . habendum donandumque cuicumque uoluerit*'. It is possible that this clause was introduced into the text at a later date, possibly by someone who was attempting to restore the full wording of a drastically abbreviated charter, and who was accustomed to the appearance of this sort of wording in grants to laymen. But it may be genuine: there is a similar clause in a grant to a bishop of Rochester just over a century later, '*ut habeat et possideat et cuicumque uoluerit relinquat*' (S280); and the clause is no obstacle to the belief that the grant was both in intention and in effect a grant to Glastonbury: the majority of early grants, if their wordings are interpreted on a strictly literal basis, were made to individual churchmen, not to religious establishments, but it is clear that in this and other respects, a strictly literal interpretation of charter wordings would be misleading.

There is no invocation or proem. The humility formula used by the donor was also used by his contemporary, Daniel, bishop of Winchester (Tangl, no. 11). The beneficiary is cited as abbot Ealdberht,

and there is no reference to his monastery, nor is there any reference to royal consent, as in the case of bishop Hæddi's charter, discussed above. The boundaries of the estate are indicated very briefly in Latin, and are likely to be authentic: they are similar to the short, Latin bounds given in charters of Centwine and Ine, discussed above (S237, 238). The sanction, which threatens a transgressor with separation from God and his saints, is not unlike those in some other early West Saxon charters (S235, 1164). The single surviving attestation is quite normal in wording. The dating clause follows it, which was probably not the arrangement of the original charter.

The estate granted by bishop Forthere consisted of one hide adjacent to the river 'Aesce', now the Axe, and extended 'ad portam que dicitur Bledenythe ad insulam paruum et ad ecclesiam beati Martini confessoris'. This account closely corresponds with a section of the boundary of Glastonbury Twelve Hides, as given by William of Malmesbury: the boundary passed along an ancient water-course 'usque ad pontem de Bledenye et sic descendendo per medium illius pontis usque ad Litleneye que est diuisa de Martenesye' (DA, p. 150). The 'Bledenythe' of the charter is now Bleadney, and it appears that the 'portam' of the charter is a miscopying of 'pontem'. The 'insulam paruum' is presumably to be identified with 'Litleneye', and the church of St. Martin stood upon an island consequently known as 'Marteneseye', now Marchey. Clearly the boundary of the estate coincided with that of Glastonbury Twelve Hides, and the estate seems to have been included in the twelve hides, since that area was said to incorporate 'insula de Marteneseye cum adiacensiis' (DA, p. 152). The estate was known in later years by the name Bleadney: this name is used in the cartularist's rubric, in the Liber Terrarum (LT 11) and in the inventory of charters (IC A18). Apart from the

Glastonbury forgery already mentioned, the name occurs in only one other pre-Conquest charter, a spurious pancarta of Wells (S1042), where its appearance is difficult to account for. Possibly the see of Wells owned an adjacent area outside the Glastonbury boundary, or perhaps an entirely different area had the same name.

* * * * *

S250

Longleat House, manuscript 39, fos. 58vv.

(Edition: B142)

A charter which purports to be a grant of extensive privileges by king Ine and is dated 725 survives in both manuscripts of the cartulary, in William of Malmesbury's De Antiquitate Glastonie Ecclesie and Gesta Regum Anglorum, in John of Glastonbury's Cronica, and in transcripts of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Differences between the versions are of no great significance. The document is a flagrant forgery. Much of the content is concerned with preventing encroachment by the bishop of Wells, 'idem episcopus ... cum clericis suis qui Fontanetum sunt', whose see was not founded until 909 (Napier and Stevenson, no. 7, EHD, no. 229; B614, 615). Among the grants by other kings which Ine is said to confirm is one which post-dates his reign, Æthilheard's grant of 'Poholt' (S253), while another, Coenwalh's alleged grant of Meare, is a fabrication which also post-dates this reign (S227). Nothing in the charter suggests that it has any genuine basis. The wording is very long and complicated, bearing no resemblance to eighth-century phraseology, and the rights and privileges claimed for Glastonbury go far beyond what any genuine, early charter allows.

Encroachment by the bishop of Wells began in the time of the first Norman abbot, Thurstan, and continued to be a problem to Glastonbury for a century (DA, p. 2). It seems likely that this charter was produced as part of Glastonbury's attempts to defend its rights and property against the bishop, and that it was written some time after the Conquest. The document is of some value as a historical source for Glastonbury at that time, including a considerable amount of information about the community's attitude to, and relations with, other persons, as well as details about the monastery, such as the places where there were churches subject to it and the arrangements for providing hospitality to the bishop of Wells on the occasion of his visits. But the charter is not a historical source for Ine's reign.

The witness list is probably a compilation by the post-Conquest author of the charter. The first seven names in it could easily have been borrowed from other Glastonbury charters or narrative sources. Ine is at the head of the list, followed by his queen, Æthilburh, whose name might have been taken from the Chronicle (ASC, s.a. 722). Baldred is presumably the sub-king, active in Centwine's reign, who is not likely to have been still alive towards the end of Ine's reign, and whose name could be taken from early Glastonbury charters (S236, 238, 1665; ECW, no. 358). Æthilheard, described as the queen's brother, is probably meant to be identified with Ine's successor, who was also a benefactor of Glastonbury (S253, 1676); the alleged relationship is probably just a guess based on the common element in the two names. Three churchmen follow, archbishop Berhtwald and bishops Daniel and Forthere, who all appear in other Glastonbury charters and in Bede and the Chronicle (S248, 251, 253, 1253; HE V 8, 18, 23; ASC, s.a. 693, 709, 731). The

remaining five persons, Waldhere prefectus, Bruta prefectus, Æthilheard, Umning prefectus and Winchelin comes are unidentified, and the second, fourth and fifth names do not appear to be Anglo-Saxon personal names at all. The source of these names is unknown.

It seems unlikely that this list has any authentic basis. Suspicious features are the inclusion of Baldred at a date when he is most unlikely still to have been alive; the presence of archbishop Berhtwald at what otherwise appears to be an entirely West Saxon assembly; and the three names which do not appear to be genuine Anglo-Saxon personal names. This witness list recurs in a charter in the cartulary of Muchelney which shares the wording of another Glastonbury charter (S249, cf. S251). The Muchelney document appears to be a fabrication produced by using Glastonbury records, and it seems reasonably certain that the list has been copied from a Glastonbury record into the Muchelney charter, so that its existence in another cartulary cannot be considered independent or corroborative evidence.

* * * * *

Charters of the mid-eighth century

Four Glastonbury charters dating from the period 725 to 756 may usefully be considered in conjunction since a comparison of their wordings reveals extensive similarities. These are:-

S	Date	Donor	Beneficiary
251	725	Ine, king	Glastonbury community
253	726 x 740	Æthilheard, king	Glastonbury community under abbot Coengils
1410	744	Lulle, nun	Glastonbury community under abbot Tunberht
257	740 x 756	Cuthred, king	(Glastonbury)

Similar wordings are also found in Æthilbald's endorsement of Ine's grant of Brent Knoll, and in a charter recording a grant of Cuthred to Malmesbury (S238, 256). The parallels of wording are considered below, but it may be useful first to consider other aspects of each charter individually.

* * * * *

S251

Longleat House, manuscript 39, fo. 174.

(Edition: Watkin, Glastonbury Cart., no. 903)

The first of this group of charters records a grant by Ine to the community of Glastonbury in 725 of an estate at 'Sowy', now Middlezoy in Somerset. It survives in the manuscripts of the cartulary. The fairly complex wording of the text contrasts with the brief and simple wordings of the other surviving charters of the reign, which tends to suggest that this is a fabrication, but this impression may be misleading. Of the other charters of Ine, all those which appear to be authentic date from the first half of the reign, 688 to 706 (S238, 240, 243, 244, 245/6, 248, 252). The Middlezoy charter dates from 19 years later than the latest of these, and this is a long time in the context of the development of early West Saxon charters, bearing in mind that the earliest of all extant charters of Wēsex dates from only about 50 years before this one (S1164). It is not unreasonable that this charter should differ conspicuously from the other extant charters of Ine, and have more in common with Æthilheard's grant of a few years later, and with other charters of the succeeding reigns. Serious consideration should therefore be given to the possibility that this charter is genuine or has some genuine basis.

There is no invocation, perhaps because this has been omitted by a copyist. The proem bears some resemblance to that in a charter of Æthelwulf of over a century later (S298), but the wording is far more complex in the later text, so that the two versions seem quite acceptable as eighth- and ninth-century work respectively. Ine is described as 'rex Westsaxonum', a title common in later West Saxon royal charters (S253, 257, 261, 262), but not earlier ones. His queen is associated with him in the grant: 'una cum coniuge et Elburge' (sic: the name Æthilburh has evidently been misread; cf. 'et Elbaldi' for the name Æthilbald in Lulle's charter). None of the authentic charters which date from the first half of the reign contains any reference to the queen, but the involvement of king Æthilheard's wife, Frithugyth, is a feature of the extant charters of the next reign, and she is recorded as making a grant to Glastonbury in her own name (S253, 254 (spurious but having an apparently genuine witness list which includes the queen), 255, 1677), while Cynithryth, wife of Offa of Mercia, and Eadburh, his daughter, who married Beorhtric, king of the West Saxons (786-802), appear in a number of late eighth-century charters (Cynithryth: S59, 110, 111, 116, 117, etc.; Eadburh: S149, 268, 270a). The reference to queen Æthilburh therefore fits eighth-century developments. She is also mentioned in the Chronicle in 722 as having demolished Taunton which Ine had built (ASC, s.a. 722). In the absence of any further details, it is impossible to interpret this event, but it tends to suggest that Æthilburh was a person of some power and importance in Wessex in the closing years of Ine's reign, and this is consistent with her appearance in a charter of 725. The charter is dated by an incarnational year and an indiction which agree and may both be genuine. There follows a boundary clause in the form of a perambulation in Old English, which is evidently

a later interpolation, and the witness list has been abbreviated to the subscriptions of king Ine and bishop Forthere, plus the note 'cum multis aliis'.

The charter grants 12 hides at 'Sowy', identified as Zoy, Somerset (ECW, no. 379; S251). Three place-names in an area about ten miles south-east of Glastonbury incorporate this name, Chedzoy, Westonzoyland and Middlezoy. Grundy, using the boundaries, tentatively locates the estate at Middlezoy (Grundy 1935, p. 116; Morland 1982, p. 233 suggests that it covered a wider area, including Westonzoyland and Othery). The only other appearances of this estate in pre-Conquest charters occurs in texts confirming Glastonbury's possession (S250, 303, 783). In 1066 Glastonbury held 'Sowy', assessed at 12 hides and identified by the translator as Middlezoy (DB Somerset, p. 8.6). The agreement with the Domesday name and hideage is not a feature suggesting authenticity in a charter of Ine. Early West Saxon charters seldom use the same place-names as later records or reflect quite the same organisation of land, and estates are often described in terms which make it very difficult to equate them with Domesday manors. It is impossible to assert that a charter of 725 could not use a name and specify a hideage still current in the eleventh century, and in Somerset, where usable land in the early Saxon period probably consisted of islands amid marshes, estates may have retained their identities and hideages over a long period of time, but nevertheless there seems to be a distinct possibility that the description of the land has been modernised, probably by the copyist who introduced the boundary clause.

* * * * *

S253

Bodleian Wood empt. 1, fo. 152r

(Edition: Watkin, Glastonbury Cart., no. 648)

This charter records a grant by king Æthilheard and queen Frithugyth to the community of Glastonbury under abbot Coengils of an extensive estate described as 60 hides at 'Pouholt'. The involvement of the queen as a feature of the extant charters of this reign is mentioned above, and is likely to be genuine since it is scarcely probable that copyists at three different monasteries borrowed Frithugyth's name from the Chronicle. Abbot Coengils was the beneficiary of a lost charter of Frithugyth, and also appears in the abbatial list, in a Winchester witness list of Æthilheard's reign which appears to be genuine although appended to a spurious charter, and in a letter (Sl677, 254; Tangl, no. 55; see also ibid., no. 101).

There is no invocation or proem, and these have perhaps been omitted by a copyist. Æthilheard's title is 'rex Westsaxonum', as in Ine's charter discussed above. The charter is dated 729 by an incarnational year: probably an indiction, and possibly other details, have been omitted. A year of grace could well be a genuine part of a charter wording at this date, and the date given here may be correct, but it cannot be checked, so the text can only be dated with certainty to Æthilheard's reign, 726-740. The document was written 'in loco qui appellatur Pencrik', and a charter of king Cyniwulf (757-786) granting land to abbot Eadwald of Muchelney is dated from the same place (S261: Bates, Muchelney Cartulary, p. 47 n. 1). 'Pencrik' is unidentified, but was perhaps in Somerset near to the monasteries of Glastonbury and Muchelney.

The witness list appears authentic. It has been abbreviated by the omission of laymen, the extant text ending with the clause

'et omnes principes consenserunt et confirmauerunt', but the names which remain are unobjectionable as part of a genuine list. The names of the king and queen are followed by an abbot named Beornfrith, who is otherwise unknown, and bishops Daniel of Winchester and Forthere of Sherborne. No distinction is made between lay and clerical witnesses in their attestation forms. This may represent the beginning of the abandonment of this practice, which occurred during the eighth century, or may simply be an instance of the use of the 'Ego ... subscripsi' (or similar) form for royal witnesses, which occurs in some early West Saxon charters (Eg. S1164). Daniel's subscription includes both his usual humility formula 'plebis dei famulus' and the word 'canonice' which is used elsewhere by him and by his successor, bishop Hunfrith (S255, 259).

The boundaries of the estate follow the witness list. They are in Latin and very brief, merely stating the landmarks on the four sides of the estate, and are therefore likely to be genuine, although the place-names have been modernised (Grundy 1935, p. 115), and the southern boundary, which takes the form of a perambulation, 'ab austro dirimit Carswelle in Cari et Cari usque in locum que dicitur Chedesie', may have been re-written. The bounds indicate that the land granted by Æthilheard and Frithugyth comprised much of the Polden Hills, a few miles west of Glastonbury, extending from the modern village of Chilton Polden in the west to Walton in the east (Ibid.; ECW, no. 381; Morland 1982, p. 234). The name 'Pouholt' does not survive, and in 1066 the area was divided into the two manors of Shapwick and Walton, assessed at 30 hides each and both held by Glastonbury (DB Somerset, pp. 8.5, 8.11). The obsolete place-name and different organisation of the land in the charter suggest that this is a genuine, early document: a writer of later date would have been likely to

introduce details corresponding with those in Domesday Book.

* * * * *

S1410

Longleat House, manuscript 39, fos. 153v-4.

(Edition: Watkin, Glastonbury Cart., no. 766).

This charter survives only in the two manuscripts of the cartulary, but a single sheet version was extant in 1247 (IC A19), and the cartularist apparently used a single sheet as his exemplar. The document records a sale of land to Glastonbury in 744 by a woman named Lulle with the consent of Æthilbald, king of the Mercians. The text presents a rather confused appearance, chiefly because the dating clause and witness list are incorporated into the dispositio instead of being separate. There follows a rather odd boundary clause, and then a passage which argues the need for a written record of boundaries to prevent disputes. An endorsement is added which confirms Æthilbald's consent and includes a sanction and blessing, a further dating clause and a second witness list headed by Æthilbald and including both Mercians and West Saxons.

The donor, Lulle, is otherwise unknown. She is described as 'militancium Christo humilis ancilla', and was presumably a nun, possibly an abbess. The text mentions the souls of those joined to her by the bonds of associations and necessities, 'pro redempcione mee anime eorumque uidelicet qui michi contribulium ac necessitudinum nexibus conglutinati sunt', and this presumably refers to the other members of her community, the masculine gender reflecting the fact that in a double monastery there were both men and women. In the clause already mentioned as discussing the need for a written record

of boundaries, reference is made to the possibility of dispute 'inter tributarios uestros nostrosque colonos'. The implication seems to be that the boundary of this estate is also the boundary between the respective lands of the two monasteries, and this may indicate that Lulle's monastery was not far from Glastonbury. The beneficiary is the community of Glastonbury under abbot Tunberht. The existence of this abbot is confirmed by his appearance in a witness list which seems authentic although appended to a dubious Winchester charter; he also appears in the abbatial list, erroneously as 'Hunbeorht', and is cited by William of Malmesbury as the beneficiary of two charters not now extant, a grant of Cuthred in 745 and one of Æthilbald in 746 (S242; S1678, 1679).

The transaction took place 'cum consciencia uidelicet ac regali licencia eius qui Britannice insule monarchiam dispensat regalisque regni regimina gubernat . Athelbaldi'. The claims made for the Mercian king here resemble those in his original charter of 736: 'rex non solum Marcersium sed et omnium prouinciorum quae generale . nomine Sutangli dicuntur' and 'rex Brittanniae' (S89), so the clause is probably genuine. Furthermore, it is apparent that Æthilbald was involved in the affairs of Glastonbury at about this time. His grant of 746 is mentioned above; he confirmed Ine's grant of land at Brent Knoll; and he is mentioned as a benefactor of the house in a charter of king Cuthred which confirms earlier grants (S238, 257). The Chronicle states that Æthilbald occupied Somerton in 733. It is not certain that this is the Somerton in Somerset, but the possibility receives some support from the Glastonbury evidence. Lulle's charter is the first recorded Glastonbury charter from the period after 733.

The first of the two witness lists included in this charter reads:-

cum adstipulacione litterarum et idoneorum testium .
 Tunberti abbatis . Bosan . Urtan . Walcstodes .
 Tidbertes . sacerdotum . et Tidan prepositi . Cuthwynisque
 comitis.

None of these men is known except the abbot. The names Bosa and Walcstod occur in the abbatial list, but neither is recorded elsewhere as an abbot, and it may be that the compiler misunderstood some commemorative record relating to priests of Glastonbury. The witness list is probably genuine: it does not resemble the lists produced by fabricators of charters, which commonly consist of famous men recorded in the Historia Ecclesiastica or the Chronicle (Eg. S228, 230); although the individuals are unknown, the names appear to be genuine Anglo-Saxon personal names of an early date, three of them being short names such as were not generally used in the tenth century and later, while Cuthwine is also an example of a name which became obsolete, since no Cuth- name except Cuthberht continued in use in later centuries (Smart 1981, pp. xiii-xv). It appears to be a specifically Glastonbury witness list, chiefly composed of members of the community, to be compared with the Christ Church witness lists occurring in some charters of the Canterbury archives (Eg. S1259, 1264, 1265, 1438). The two laymen were perhaps connected with the house in some way, for example as tenants on its estates or local noblemen. It may not be coincidence that the bounds mention a place named 'Tidanlegh'. The content of the witness list is consistent with the apparently local nature of the transaction, which seems to have been a transfer of property between neighbouring houses.

The other witness list is part of the endorsement, 'pittancium', apparently added to confirm Æthilbald's consent. The first two names on the list are Æthilbald and Cuthred. Neither is given a title, but the first can only be the Mercian king, and the second is presumably

the West Saxon king. 'Oua suffragator' is a Mercian layman who attests numerous charters of Æthilbald during the period 727-748 (S85, 89, 91, etc). The next witness appears as 'Athellen', a garbled name which is perhaps most likely to be Æthilhun, and this man may therefore be the 'arrogant ealdorman' whom Cuthred fought in 750 (ASC s.a. 750). Herewald was bishop of Sherborne in succession to Forthere, and abbot Dud attests a charter of Aethilheard in 739 (S255). 'Heortbearht auxiliator' is probably Æthilbald's brother who attests Mercian charters from 736 to the end of the reign (Eg. S89, 94, 96, 103). There is no objection to any of these names, and the presence of obscure men recorded elsewhere strongly suggests that the list is authentic.

Lulle's charter is dated the 10th July with no indication of year, but the endorsement is dated 744, and it seems likely that this is also the year of the grant since the confirmation of Æthilbald is not a later addition reflecting changed circumstances, but was envisaged at the time of the transaction, as the reference to it in the dispositio shows. The sale was made in a church dedicated to the apostles Peter and Paul. It is not entirely impossible that the church at Malmesbury, which had this dedication, is meant, but in this context it is perhaps more likely that this was the church at Lulle's monastery.

A boundary clause which is short, in Latin except for place-names, and not very intelligible, bearing no resemblance to the practised perambulations of a later age, is likely to be genuine. The passage which discusses the need for boundaries is introduced by the clause 'Hec uero uocabulorum signa Tomi stilo indita sunt'. This seems to have been understood by the cartularist, who gave a capital letter to 'Tomi', to indicate the name of the scribe, but 'Tomus' can scarcely be an Anglo-Saxon personal name, and it is difficult to see what

is meant; the text is probably corrupt. It is asserted that disputes are of frequent occurrence when boundaries are not clearly recorded. This seems to fit a mid-eighth-century context, when detailed boundaries begin to appear in charters in England and elsewhere, probably because the need for them had been made apparent by the occurrence of such disputes as this charter mentions.

There are some unusual words in this text, notably the titles given to laymen, 'prepositus' in the first witness list and 'suffragator' and 'auxiliator' in the second; also 'archimandrita' used in place of 'abbas' in one reference to Tunberht. 'Rus' used instead of 'terra' is also unusual. But the text as a whole is rather more verbose than necessary, and these words are not inconsistent with the style of the document, while the unusual titles find an echo in bishop Herewald's 'speculator ecclesie dei' in Æthilbald's confirmatory witness list to Ine's Brent Knoll charter, and 'rus' is used in a Kentish charter of 732 which is extant in contemporary form (S23). The attestation forms in the second witness list seem suspicious, incorporating several different verbs of subscription and confirmation and a certain amount of repetition, e.g. in Cuthred's subscription: '+ Ego Cuthred annuens subscripsi firmauique subscripsi et confirmaui deuotamente'. It seems that there is accidental miscopying here, and probably also some deliberate elaboration by someone copying out the document.

Lulle sells to Glastonbury (the phrase 'placata precio muneris accepti extimplo prolati' seems to indicate that a price has been paid) an estate of 10 hides at 'Balteresberg et Scobbanwirht'. The former, now Baltonsborough, about $3\frac{1}{2}$ miles south-east of Glastonbury, occurs in no other pre-Conquest charter. It was owned by Glastonbury in 1066 and was assessed at 5 hides (DB Somerset, p. 8.22). 'Scobbanwirht'

does not survive as a place-name, does not appear in Domesday Book and is not mentioned in any Glastonbury record of this charter, all references being solely to Baltonsborough. Its only other occurrence in pre-Conquest charters is in a boundary clause of later date, from which it appears that the place lay in the northern part of Baltonsborough parish (S292; Grundy 1935, p. 61).

The charter goes on to say that the same amount of land (i.e. 10 hides) at 'Lottisham' and 'Ledenford' is relinquished to the judgement of king Æthilbald. The point of this provision is not entirely clear, but it may be that the lands mentioned in this charter had been the subject of a dispute and that agreement had been reached over the others, but it was left for Æthilbald to decide about these. Lottisham, about 2 miles east of Glastonbury, was granted by Æthelwulf to ealdorman Eanwulf in 842 (S292). The area was 5 hides, and 25 hides at Ditchheat were also granted. Lottisham is not mentioned in Domesday Book, but Ditchheat was owned by Glastonbury in 1066 and was assessed at 30 hides (DB Somerset, p. 8.30), so the probability is that Lottisham was included in this estate. 'Ledenford' is now Lydford, about 2 miles south-east of Glastonbury. It does not recur in charters but was owned by Glastonbury in 1066 and was assessed at 4 hides (DB Somerset, p. 8.4).

The organisation of these lands when this charter was drafted seems to have been this: one estate of 10 hides comprised 5 hides at Baltonsborough and 5 hides at 'Scobbanwirht', while another estate of 10 hides comprised 5 hides at Lottisham and 5 hides at Lydford. But in 842 if not before, Lottisham was detached from Lydford and grouped with the 25 hides at Ditchheat to form an estate of 30 hides. Lydford was left as an estate in itself, as it appears in Domesday Book. Baltonsborough also stands alone in Domesday as an estate

of 5 hides, so 'Scobbanwirht' has at some stage been detached from it. As Æthelwulf's Ditchet charter is the one in which 'Scobbanwirht' is named in the boundary clause, it may be that the land is included in that estate. On this basis the new organisation of lands is: one estate of 5 hides at Baltonsborough; one estate of 5 (or 4) hides at Lydford; and one estate of 30 hides at Ditchet incorporating 5 hides at 'Scobbanwirht' and 5 hides at Lottisham. These three estates appear in Domesday Book and this arrangement of the lands appears to date from at least the mid-eighth century.

This seems to be a very strong argument in favour of the basic authenticity of Lulle's charter. The details produced by a forger would have matched those obtaining at a later date. The different arrangements described in the charter can only represent the work of a scribe writing before 842. Moreover, the charter does not claim that Lottisham and Lydford are owned by Glastonbury, as a forger would have done if he had mentioned them at all.

* * * * *

S257

Longleat House, manuscript 39, fos. 58v-59.

(Edition: Watkin, Glastonbury Cart., no. 201).

A charter in the name of king Cuthred (740-756) confirming the grants of earlier kings to Glastonbury survives in the cartularies and in transcriptions which William of Malmesbury included in his De Antiquitate Glastonie Ecclesie and Gesta Regum (DA, p. 104; GR, p. 40). The cartularist does not mention that he used a copy, but no single-sheet version of this charter is included in the inventory of 1247. It may have been omitted from the inventory because it grants nothing new, but is merely a confirmation of earlier gifts,

and does not really fit any of the categories used. Or it may be that the cartularist worked from a transcript and forgot to say so.

The text begins with an invocation of the common 'In nomine ...' type. There is no proem. The dispositio states that Cuthred confirms all grants of the former kings Centwine, Baldred, Ceadwalla, Ine, Æthilheard, and Æthilbald of Mercia, so that they may endure for ever. There follows a sanction and then an abbreviated witness list. The three names preserved by the copyist are those of Cuthred, bishop Herewald, who was Forthere's successor at Sherborne, and attests other charters of the mid eighth century (S96, 238, 257, 260, 261, 262, 265, 1256, 1410), and Combra, described as a prefectus of the king, who is probably to be identified with that ealdorman who stood by Sigiberht longest and was killed by him at last (ASC s.a. 757). William of Malmesbury adds the subscription of bishop Daniel. After the witness list there is a long dating clause which states that the charter was promulgated in the monastery at a ceremony in the wooden church in which the monks had placed abbot Hæmgils' sarcophagus. The year is given only as an incarnational date, and the charter is dated 744 in some manuscripts and 745 in others (Watkin, Glastonbury Cart., p. 142; B169 n. 16; DA, p. 200 n. 95); some manuscripts add the day, 30th April (B169 n. 15).

A few features of this document suggest the possibility that it may be basically authentic. One is the correspondence of sections of its wording with passages in other mid-eighth-century charters, as is further discussed below. Another is the fact that there is no motive for forgery. Spurious confirmatory charters, like the fabricated privilege of Ine mentioned above, usually include extensive grants of privileges. In this case nothing is added to the earlier grants except that the sanction threatens not only anyone who

dares to infringe the terms of the charter, but also anyone who dares:-

gressum pedis uobis Hengissingum traditum urbemque
glebam extra treminos prefixos uel definitos limites
seu constitutos adimere.

The clause is translated by Scott:-

to take away the foot-merchet or hanging fine that we have
made over or the rich land outside the fixed boundaries and
established borders (DA, p. 105).

This can scarcely be eighth-century drafting, and appears to have been interpolated into the sanction at a much later date in order to claim these rights. But it does not seem likely that the whole document has been fabricated for the sake of this provision, whose position in the sanction makes it look like an afterthought. Nor is it likely that the document was fabricated merely to add the authority of Cuthred's name to earlier grants, since he was not a particularly famous king, and was not likely to have been chosen for such a purpose.

It is a point in favour of the charter that the list of kings whose grants are said to be confirmed does not include Coenwalh, since one would expect a forger of tenth-century or later date, who would be acquainted with the fabricated charter in Coenwalh's name, to include him in a list of early Glastonbury benefactors. The list does include Ceadwalla, who is not known to have made any grants to Glastonbury, but it is quite possible that there existed in the eighth century a charter in his name of which no trace now survives. The only recorded grant by Æthilbald of Mercia to the monastery is dated 746 by William of Malmesbury (DA, p. 104), which implies that it post-dates Cuthred's charter; but this discrepancy is not significant because incarnational dates in Glastonbury charters are so often wrong that it is impossible to rely either on the date given by William for Æthilbald's grant or either of the dates given in extant manuscripts of Cuthred's charter. Moreover, it is possible that Æthilbald's

name was used in reference to his confirmation of Lulle's charter. The witness list seems to be authentic: a forger would not have been likely to include the obscure ealdorman Combra.

Although there is no other authentic early charter resembling that of Cuthred in being solely a general confirmation of earlier grants, there are plenty of records of later royal confirmation of gifts. These take the form of an endorsement added to the particular charter concerned, and usually consist of a witness list, with or without an explanatory rubric. The endorsement in Æthilbald's name added to Ine's grant of Brent Knoll is an example (S238) and others are the witness lists headed by the Mercian kings Coenred (704-709) and Ceolred (709-716) which are appended to an East Saxon charter of 704 to confirm successive confirmations of the transaction (S65), and Offa's endorsement of a charter of Oslac, dux of the South Saxons (S1184).

The content of Cuthred's charter is consistent with the political history of the time. The reason for a later confirmation of a grant was often that political power in the area had changed and a monastic community sought confirmation of the possession of its estates from a conqueror who might otherwise seize the lands. It seems likely that Glastonbury obtained Cuthred's confirmation of earlier grants for this reason. Æthilbald of Mercia appears to have brought Somerset under his control during the reign of Æthilheard and remained in power there during part of Cuthred's reign: he occupied Somerton, probably in Somerset, in 733 (ASC s.a. 733); he confirmed Ine's grant of Brent Knoll, and he authorised Lulle's sale of Baltonsborough in 744. According to Bede, Æthilbald had authority over all the kingdoms south of the Humber in 731 (HE V 23). But Cuthred seems to have had some success in reversing this trend. The Chronicler

recorded that he fought resolutely against Æthilbald, and the Continuatio Baedae states that he rose against the Mercian king and against Angus, king of the Picts, who was evidently in alliance with Mercia, in 750 (ASC s.a. 740; HE, p. 574). And extant charters and records of charters indicate that Cyniwulf (757-786) was the effective ruler of Somerset throughout his reign (S261, 262, 265, 1681-1690; ECW, no. 390); there is no further trace of Mercian power in the area until the time of Offa (S1692, ECW, no. 397). It seems likely that in the 750s Cuthred restored West Saxon power in Somerset, and that the community at Glastonbury, released from Mercian dominance, secured his agreement that they could continue in possession of the estates which in recent years had been held by permission of Æthilbald of Mercia.

There is no reference in Cuthred's charter to non-royal grants, but it is likely that these were intended to be included in the general confirmation. The author of the charter probably took the view that such grants were made by royal authority, and that the estates concerned were subsequently held by royal permission, so that the terms of the charter would automatically include them.

It is therefore possible that this document has some basis in an authentic charter of Cuthred. But, like other Glastonbury charters, it seems to have been substantially re-written. The list of the component parts of the estates is very unusual: 'in uillis et in uicis atque agris ac prediis massis et maioribus'. The text includes the phrases 'pristina urbs Glastingei' and 'in lignea basilica', both of which are among the interpolations in the Glastonbury version of Ine's grant of privileges of 704. The confirmed grants are said to endure 'quamdiu uertigo poli terras atque ecora circa ethera siderum iusso moderamine uoluet', an unusual wording which seems unlikely

to be genuine, and the donor's long attestation also seems suspicious. It appears likely that a copyist has re-drafted the document in order to improve and strengthen it.

There is no reason why the reference to the sarcophagus of abbot Hæmgils should not be genuine in a charter drawn up some 50 years after his death, and this clause, in conjunction with other evidence, tends to suggest that Hæmgils was regarded with particular reverence at Glastonbury for some time after his death. The wording seems to indicate that the sarcophagus was placed in the church at or above the floor level, rather than that it was buried, and such an arrangement was a sign of the dead man's sanctity (Campbell 1982, p. 80). Moreover, the presence of the sarcophagus was evidently considered the most notable feature of the church, since it was the one chosen to identify and describe it. The interpolated passage in Baldred's charter, referring to Hæmgils' appointment as abbot and his faithful manner of life, would have been pointless had there not been special regard for Hæmgils at Glastonbury. He is the earliest recorded abbot of the house, and was placed at the head of the abbatial list. The interpolation in Baldred's charter shows that it was the tradition of the house that he had been appointed by king Centwine with the consent of bishop Hæddi, which could well be true. The evidence suggests that Hæmgils was the founder of the Saxon monastery at Glastonbury, and that the community, like many other early religious communities, regarded their founder as a saint, but that this cult died out, probably when interest in pre-Saxon Glastonbury became prominent and attention was turned to the early Irish saints.

* * * * *

Wordings of S251, 253, 1410 and 257

These four charters, plus Cuthred's grant to Malmesbury (S256) form a distinct group because of the connections between their wordings. The other West Saxon charters dating from the period 725-756 do not belong to this group. The grant of privileges in Ine's name discussed above is a fabrication (S250). A grant of Æthilheard and Frithugyth to Winchester may have some authentic basis, but seems in its extant form to be entirely the work of a later period (S254). The Muchelney charter which shares the wording of the grant by Ine of Middlezoy is a fabrication (S249). Æthilheard's Crediton charter seems to be genuine (S255), but has little in common with these texts, belonging rather to the tradition of extreme simplicity which is characteristic of most early West Saxon charters. The correspondences between these charters are frequently striking. They are described below and the relevant passages are quoted in full.

In the first two charters the queen is cited as donor jointly with the king:-

S251: 'Ini rex Westsaxonum una cum coniuge et Elburge'.

S253: 'Athelardus rex Wēstsaxonum simulque regina Fridogifa'.

The specified beneficiary of an early grant to a monastery is usually the abbot. In most of these charters it is the community, although the abbot is usually named:-

S251: 'Cristi familie que in Glastingburg' omnipotenti domino uoluntarie deuocionis obsequium impendit';

S253: 'familie que in monasterio Glastingaburi, sub religioso abbate Cengislo fideli Deo famulatur obsequio';

S1410: 'familie que in monasterio Glastyngaburgh . sub simplicis archimandrite dispositis regulis . Tunbertes fideli deo famulatur obsequio';

S257: (no beneficiary named)

S256: 'Aldhelmo abbati familiaeque sub illius regiminis amore degenti'.

None of these charters contains an exemption from secular burdens, but such exemptions began to appear in Wessex at this time and there is a clause in four of these charters which may reflect the idea behind exemptions:-

- S251: 'dei seruorum mancipare usibus decreuimus ... inconuulsa collacione';
- S253: 'Ita ut ex hoc die inconuulso iure prefata possessio ipsius monasterii usibus mancipetur';
- S1410: 'Ita ut ex hoc die inconuulso iure prefata possessio ipsius monasterii usibus mancipetur';
- S256: 'Sit autem praedicta possessio ipsius monasterii usibus mancipata deinceps incessabili iugitate'.

A phrase in the Malmesbury charter's description of the land closely echoes one of the Glastonbury charters, and the phrase may therefore be genuine here, although it also reflects tenth-century practice:

- S1410: 'sub . x . manencium estimacione certa taxatam';
- S256: 'sub x mansionum estimatione taxatam'.

The sanctions are similar in all cases, and the one included in Æthilbald's confirmatory endorsement of Ine's Brent Knoll charter may also be compared:-

- S251: 'Si quis uero cuiuslibet dignitatis uel potencie quouis deinceps tempore qualibet occasione. hanc infringere tirannica fretus presumptione collacionem temptauerit sit a collegio catholice ecclesie separatus';
- S253: 'Quapropter si quis quouis deinceps tempore tirannica fretus insolentia sub qualibet occasione interrumpere atque in irritum deducere insolubile placiti istius testamentum nisus fuerit, sit a consorcio piorum ultimi examinis ventilabro dispertitus rapaciumque collegio combinatus violencie sue penas luat';
- S1410: 'quapropter si quis quouis deinceps tempore tirannica fretus insolencia qualibet occasione interrumpere . atque in irritum deducere . seu unius iugeris spacium placiti istius testamentum nisus fuerit sit a consorcio ecclesie Christi anathema extremique ventilabro examinis dispertitus rapaciumque collegio combinatus uiolencie sue presumptionem luat in euum';

- S257: 'Si quis autem huius mee donacionis testamentum nisus fuerit confringere ... ipse acrius multatus sit infernales ergastuli in pena demersus uiolencieque sue presumpcionem luat in euum Amen';
- S256: 'Si quis hujus largitionis meae stipem tyrannica fretus insolentia qualibet occasione interrumpere atque in irritum deducere nisus fuerit, sit a consortio piorum ultimi ventilabro examinis sequestratus rapaciumque collegio combinatus uiolentie suae poenas luat';
- S238: 'si quis autem quouis deinceps tempore hoc infringere tot nobilitatis gradibus roboratum presumeret ius sit a consorcio bene merencium anathema rapaciumque collegio adplicitus temeritatis sue commissa luat sub diris dentibus salamandri cerberique rettibus reatum exsoluat proprium sine fine semper merens'.

The blessings also resemble each other, and here too the wording of Æthilbald's endorsement may be included:-

- S251: 'si quis uero pia peditus intencione hec probare ac defendere curauerit amplificet deus porcionem eius in terra uiuencium';
- S253: 'si quis uero benivola potius predictus intentione hec probare ac defendere studuerit, videat bona Domini in terra vivencium';
- S1410: 'Qui uero beniuola potius peditus intencione hec probare . roborare ac defendere studuerit uoti compos ipse altritoni gloriam ascultet indefecta perhennitate cum faustis agminibus angelorum atque omnium sanctorum';
- S257: (none)
- S256: 'Si quis uero benivola intencione potius praeditus hoc donationem ampliare voluerit, videat ovans bona domini cum angelorum agminibus'.
- S238: 'si quis uero beniuola intencione potius peditus hec exacta decernit possideat bona sempiterna cum bene merentibus'.

In four cases the dating clauses incorporate some similar phraseology, and in three of these a ceremony at the altar is described in much the same terms:

- S253: 'Huius donacionis cartula conscripta hac promulgata est ... sub presenciam regis Æthelardi';
- S1410: 'in absida dedicata quidem patrocinio eximiorum apostolorum Petri et Pauli sub quorum presenciam huius cartule donacionem altario dei propria manu . ultronea uoluntate ... tradidi';

S257: 'et exemplar huius largicionis prouulgatum est in predicto cenobio sub presencia Cuddredi regis quod proprie manus munificentia altario sacro commendauit';

S256: 'Exemplar hujus largitionis promulgatum est ... in praedicto cenobio sub praesencia Cuthredi regis quod propria manus munificentia votiva vero devotione altario sacro commendavit'.

The consent of a bishop is usually mentioned, and it is noticeable that the word 'episcopus' is only used once:-

S251: 'cum consciencia ac consensu uenerandi pontificis Fortheres';

S253: 'cum consensu nostrorum episcoporum Danielis ac Fortheres';
'uenerandorumque antistitum Danielis atque Fortheris';

S1410: 'cum consciencia ... Æthelbaldi uenerandorumque antistitum testimonio'
'cum consensu Athelbaldi regis atque imperio . reuerentissimique pontificis conscientia Herewaldi';

S257: (none)

S256: 'cum consensu atque scientia eximii praesulis Danihelis'.

The only instance of a wording in a later Glastonbury charter which furnished a close parallel with those quoted above is the sanction and blessing in a privilege in the name of Knútr (S966), and it seems likely that this document is spurious and that its author borrowed these wordings from one or more of these eighth-century charters. The sanction and blessing of Æthelwulf's grant to himself (S298) resemble those quoted above, but are more complex, and there is no reason to suspect forgery in any of the above charters because of this similarity, while Æthelwulf's charter is, of course, above suspicion since it survives as an original.

The resemblances between these charters, close but not often exact, tend to suggest the work of one scriptorium, possibly of one man, at one period of time, rather than duplication by a forger, who would not have confined his borrowings to a group of charters all dating from a period of about 30 (possibly 20) years, and all therefore acceptable as written in the same style. Although forming

a distinct group, different from other charters, these texts are not without similarities to charters of the time in other cartularies. The description of Æthilbald in Lulle's charter resembles phrases in Æthilbald's own charters, as is noticed in the discussion of this charter above. All but one (S257) of the charters mention the presence and suitability of the witnesses, and the grants of Ine and Æthilheard place far more emphasis than is usual on the strength which the charter derives from its witnesses. Such emphasis is also a feature of Æthilheard's Crediton charter (S255) and of a grant of Cuthred to Winchester in 749 (S259).

Every charter except Ine's has a witness list which appears genuine. The description of the estates in the charters of Æthilheard and Lulle suggest authenticity, as do the names of the abbots. In the case of Cuthred's confirmation of Glastonbury grants there seems to be very little motive for forgery. Only in the case of Ine's grant can it be said that the donor is the sort of person a forger could be expected to choose, and it may confidently be asserted that no forger would have invented Lulle. There seems to be a good chance that all of these charters are basically authentic, although the possibility of some interpolation and re-writing cannot be ruled out, and in some cases seems likely.

* * * * *

The Papal Privilege and S152

DA, pp. 108 and 110.

A bull in which pope Leo III confirms to king 'Kinelm' possession of the monastery of Glastonbury and all its properties, and a confirmatory charter in the name of Coenwulf, king of the Mercians (796-821),

survive only in William of Malmesbury's De Antiquitate in Latin versions which William says are his own translations of Old English exemplars (DA, pp. 108, 110). If the documents are genuine, they must originally have been in Latin, and later translated into Old English, so the surviving texts are at two removes from the original wordings.

It seems unlikely that these documents survived at Glastonbury. There is no trace of them in Glastonbury records: they are not in the fourteenth-century cartularies; they were not in the Liber Terrarum; they were not among the single sheets listed in 1247. There is, indeed, no reason to suppose that they were ever held at Glastonbury, since the community was not the beneficiary, and any copy left there would be more likely to have been destroyed than preserved. The probability is that William of Malmesbury included these documents in his account of Glastonbury since they related to Glastonbury, but that he found them elsewhere, and the place where he is most likely to have found them is Winchcombe: it is argued below that the beneficiary was a member of the Mercian royal family, and grants to him would therefore have been kept in the Mercian royal archive which was kept at Winchcombe (On the Mercian royal archive see Levison 1946, pp. 249-52). William of Malmesbury included some account of Winchcombe in both the Gesta Pontificum and the Gesta Regum (GP, pp. 294-5; GR, pp. 94-5, 374-5), and it is quite likely that he visited the monastery and examined its records.

The papal bull is dated 8th March, and there are three indications of the year, all inconsistent: third indiction, which could be 795 or 810; third year of Leo's papacy, which is 798; and 25th year of the reign of Charlemagne, which is 793. The text mentions kings Ecgfrith and Coenwulf of Mercia, who both acceded in 796, and it gives Charlemagne the titles he held before Christmas Day 800, so

the only one of the stated dates which can possibly be correct is Leo's papal year, 798(27th December, 797 to 26th December, 798). The erroneous dates are probably just scribal errors. The indiction should be the sixth, and VI may have been misread as III. Similarly, Charlemagne's regnal year should be 30, and perhaps XXX was misread as XXV.

Coenwulf's charter is dated 797, second regnal year. He became king on the 14th December 796 (Offa died on the 26th July 796; Historia Regum s.a. 796. Ecgfrith ruled for 141 days: ASC s.a. 757), so his second regnal year was 14th December 797 to 13th December 798. Probably the incarnational date in this charter should be 798, since this document post-dates the papal bull, and 798 will also fit the regnal year. 797 must be an error, perhaps resulting from the accidental omission of i from Dcc xc viii. This seems more likely than that the error is in the papal document, which would mean that tertio had been accidentally substituted for secundo in the statement of Leo's papal year. The probability is, therefore, that both documents date from 798.

The beneficiary, 'Kinelm' is not identified in either document, but his name appears to be Cynehelm or Coenhelm, he is evidently a Mercian since Coenwulf confirms the privilege in an entirely Mercian charter, and Leo's giving him the title rex indicates that he is a member of the Mercian royal family. The identification with Coenwulf's son, Cynehelm, seems reasonably certain. Nothing is known of Cynehelm except that he attests charters only during the period 803 to 811 (S40, 159, 161, 163-5, 167-8, 1187, 1260) and presumably died shortly thereafter, and that he was buried at Coenwulf's foundation of Winchcombe where the legend of his martyrdom arose (Levison 1946, p. 247; Rollason 1983, pp. 9-10). William of Malmesbury was acquainted with the legend of St. Kinelm, which is presumably why he records the name in this

form (DA, p. 110).

Both of the documents appear to be genuine. Leo's privilege incorporates all the usual components of papal privileges of the time. There is an opening protocol in which the pope greets the beneficiary. This is followed by a proem discussing the importance of written apostolic confirmations. Then the narratio refers to Cynehelm's request for confirmation of his ownership of Glastonbury, and the dispositio grants this to Cynehelm and his successors. The sanction is in three parts, prohibitive clause, penal clause and blessing, and the final protocol sets out the date of the document and names of the officials who authorise it. The only clause missing from this document is the appreciatio or amen, and this was not regularly included (On the wording of papal bulls, see Poole 1915, pp. 41-8). The two officials of the papal chancery named here both appear in other documents. Eustachius, primicerius notariorum, is mentioned with the same title in a letter of pope Leo to archbishop Æthilheard dated 802, and he and Paschal both authorise another document of 798 (B305, Jaffé 1885, no. 2498).

Coenwulf's charter contains nothing to which exception could be taken, and includes details which suggest that it is authentic. Dating by regnal year is common in Mercian charters of this time. Coenwulf's attestation, 'signum sancte crucis impressi' is similar to those in other charters of the reign, and there is another instance of an ablative absolute invocation (S153, 165; S157). William of Malmesbury has discarded the witness list, but he records that it consisted of two archbishops, 9 bishops, 13 abbots and 6 laymen. Of these he only names the two archbishops, Æthilheard of Canterbury and Hygeberht of Lichfield (of York according to William, who has overlooked the short-lived Mercian archiepiscopal see), and one abbot, Beaduwulf of Glastonbury, whose name was known to him because this

abbot was the beneficiary of a grant by Offa in 794 (S1692). It is probable that this witness list substantially corresponded with that of another charter which dates from the same year and survives as an original: that list also includes the two archbishops and 9 bishops, and there are 4 abbots and 11 laymen (S153). Cynithryth, who also attests the Glastonbury charter, may be identified with reasonable probability as Offa's widow and the abbess of Cookham, while the two ladies described as her dearest kinswomen Æthilburh and 'Celfled' are probably Offa's daughters Æthilburh, abbess of Fladbury, and Ælfflæd (S127, Levison 1946, p. 251). It seems that there was an amicable relationship during Coenwulf's reign between the king and Offa's family: Coenwulf presided at the synod at which possession of Cookham was confirmed to abbess Cynithryth (S1258). It is possible that Coenwulf and Cynithryth were relatives.

It is scarcely possible that these two documents are fabrications, since a forger would not have been able to draw up either a papal privilege in correct papal diplomatic and authorised by recorded members of the papal chancery, or a charter of Coenwulf phrased in many respects like other charters of the reign and involving a number of very obscure persons. Moreover, there is no motive for forgery of these documents, at least at Glastonbury, since their purpose, to confirm ownership of the monastery by a layman, would not have been approved of by the community at a later date, and probably conferred no benefit on Glastonbury at any time. Nor does it seem at all likely that the documents were fabricated at Winchcombe or elsewhere on behalf of the Mercian royal family: there is no record of a later Mercian claim to Glastonbury, which such fabrications might have been designed to support; moreover, the Mercian royal family remained in power only until 874, and fabrication of documents at such an early date, while not unknown, was probably

not widespread.

The papal privilege forms part of a substantial body of correspondence between the papacy and the Mercian monarchy in the late eighth century and early ninth. The correspondence seems to have begun in the reign of Offa, who obtained papal permission for the creation of a new archiepiscopal see at Lichfield (GR, pp. 86-9; trans. EHD, no. 204), and probably secured confirmation of his ownership of monasteries and their properties, as a formula for a privilege on these lines, surviving in the papal archives, appears to derive from a privilege sent to Offa: the copy omits names but accidentally retains the name of the beneficiary's wife, and this is 'Cynedridae regine', the name of Offa's queen (Foerster, Liber Diurnus, no. 93; Levison 1946, p. 30). A clause in the Glastonbury privilege suggests that Ecgfrith wrote to the pope during his short reign 'sicut Egfridus rex omnem illam terram descripsit', and there survive examples of the correspondence between Pope Leo and the Mercian rulers, king Coenwulf and archbishop Æthilheard: Leo co-operated with Coenwulf in abolishing the archiepiscopal see of Lichfield and lent his support to the Mercian takeover of Kent, anathematising the Kentish claimant, Eadberht Praen (GR, pp. 86-9; B288; GP, pp. 57-9; trans. EHD, nos. 204, 205, 209). Leo also confirmed to Coenwulf authority over various monasteries and privileges for Winchcombe (B337) and in 817 pope Paschal sent a similar confirmation (B363).

This background endorses the authenticity of the Glastonbury privilege since it fits the context of the papal/Mercian rapport of the time, and resembles other papal concessions obtained by Mercian kings. The document is one of a number of privileges confirming royal ownership of monasteries, and the correspondence concerning Kent provides a parallel for papal endorsement of Mercian interference in kingdoms outside Mercia. It is ironic that archbishop Æthilheard

informed the Council of Clofesho of 803 that pope Leo had forbidden lay ownership of monasteries (B312). This was evidently the church's theoretical position, but in practice lay ownership was an established phenomenon which even the papacy had to accept.

It is not so easy to establish the context of these documents from a West Saxon point of view. In the papal document the consent of king Beorhtric is mentioned in conjunction with the involvement of king Ecgfrith, but the nature of that involvement is not clear. In Coenwulf's charter Ecgfrith is said to have granted ownership of Glastonbury to Cynhelm, so that the present arrangements represent confirmation of an earlier agreement. On this basis Beorhtric's consent was to Mercian ownership of Glastonbury, and, as it is scarcely possible that he agreed to such a state of affairs voluntarily, the implication must be that Mercia was in a position to enforce his agreement. Unfortunately the evidence for these years is so scanty that it is impossible to establish what the Mercian position was. In 794 Offa granted an estate north of the Parrett in Somerset to Glastonbury (S1692), which might tend to suggest a Mercian takeover of the area, but it happens that Beorhtric also made a grant (not to Glastonbury) of land north of the Parrett in the same year, and his charter makes no reference to Mercian involvement (S267). It is possible that Beorhtric's grant was the earlier of the two and was followed immediately by a Mercian takeover and by Offa's grant. If this is the case, it seems that Mercian power lasted only a few years, since there was a West Saxon grant of land in Somerset in 801 (S270a). It may well be that there was no invasion, but that Beorhtric ceded Glastonbury to Mercia as part of a treaty, perhaps under threat of invasion.

* * * * *

S270a

Longleat House, manuscript 39, fo. 153r.

(Edition: Glastonbury Cart., no. 762)

A charter recording a grant of land to an otherwise unknown layman named Eadgils in 801 survives in cartulary copies. The text has a rather strange appearance because the orthography of many of the names is peculiar; it could scarcely have been produced by copying, and tends to suggest that a scribe has taken down the text from dictation at some time. The donor appears as 'Edbirtus Rex eodem donante Occidentalium Saxonum'. There was never a king Eadberht in Wessex, and the donor has been identified with queen Eadburh, daughter of Offa of Mercia and wife of king Beorhtric (786-802) (K178) or alternatively with king Ecgberht (802-839) (Watkin, Glastonbury Cart., Vol. 2, p. cxlviii; ECW, no. 401). A number of considerations suggest that the first of these suggested identifications is correct.

Firstly, the date of the charter lay within the reign of Beorhtric, not that of Ecgberht; it is given only as an incarnational year, but by the beginning of the ninth century charters were normally dated in this way, so there is no real reason to question this date. Secondly, an endorsement at the end of the charter reads 'Hanc cartulam reddidit Eadburh ad ecclesiam Glastingensem'. An annotator of the Liber Terrarum contents list suggested that Eadburh was the wife of the beneficiary, Eadgils: the entry reads 'Ecgbirtus de Budecleghe dat. Eadgillo qui G.' (i.e. who gave it to Glastonbury), and the words 'vel uxor' have been inserted above 'qui G.' (LT 38). This is not impossible, but it seems more likely that the reference is to Beorhtric's queen, that she was the donor, and that she gave the land and charter to Glastonbury, possibly following the death of the original beneficiary. The text refers to possession by Eadgils and his heirs, but in practice many such grants seem to have been only temporary or for one life: there

are many instances of repeated royal grants of the same estate to different laymen (For example in the Liber Terrarum). Thirdly, five of the seven witnesses of this charter also attest a charter of Beorhtric in the same year, and queen Eadburh is also among the witnesses of the latter text (S268). It is not likely that two witness lists corresponding so closely could belong to different reigns: the new king would have had a new entourage, especially since it seems likely that Ecgberht did not succeed peacefully as Beorhtric's accepted heir, but was a rival who secured the kingship by defeating his predecessor in battle (ASC s.a. 802, 803).

There is nothing implausible in the theory that a West Saxon queen made a grant of land. No other such charter survives, but there is a record of a charter in which Æthilheard's queen, Frithugyth, gave an estate to Glastonbury (S1677), and Lulle's charter establishes that women could and did make grants or sales of land, and have charters drawn up in their names (S1410). Moreover, Eadburh seems to have played an active and important part in West Saxon affairs during Beorhtric's reign: she attests his charter of 801 mentioned above, and also a charter of her brother Ecgfrith, during his brief reign in 796 (S149); she represented an important political alliance, and her appalling reputation in later years may possibly have had some basis in a genuinely forceful character (Stevenson, Asser, pp. 12-14): the detail of Asser's account is probably attributable to hostile propaganda following the accession of Ecgberht, who had been the enemy of her father and husband, but such rumours could scarcely have been circulated had she actually been a nonentity. It may be that Eadburh's reputation led to the deliberate suppression of her name in this charter, but, in view of the mis-spelling of other personal names, it is perhaps more likely that the name was accidentally misrepresented by a scribe who expected

and assumed that the donor was a man.

There was virtually no motive for the fabrication of a grant to a layman, so there is a strong presumption that the charter has at least an authentic basis. The wording confirms that it is basically genuine, although there seems to have been some amendment to the text in the course of copying, probably in the tenth century. The invocation is similar to those of two charters of Beorhtric, surviving in different cartularies:-

S270a: 'Regnante in perpetuum domino nostro Ihesu Christo et hec temporalia terre regna cuicumque uoluerit dispensante';

S267: 'Regnante in perpetuum domino nostro Iesu Christo nec non et hoc saeculum pulchro moderamine dispensanti';

S269: 'Regnante in perpetuum omnipotenti deo'

There is no proem, and this has perhaps been omitted by a copyist.

The grant is made to 'Eadgilso ministro meo ob eius amabile obsequium et fidelem famulatam'. In Cyniwulf's grant of 778 the beneficiary is described as 'comiti meo ac ministro', but the title minister is much more common in tenth-century charters than in early ones. The idea behind the following clause, referring to the recipient's faithful service, is expressed in different terms in Beorhtric's charters:-

S267: 'Wigfrutho Praefecto meo dilectissimo ... qui indeffessis viribus in nostra voluntate diu humiliter et diligenter laboravit';

S268: 'deuoto et cum omni studio in nostro affectu fidelissimo Lullan principi';

S269: 'Hemele fidelissimo principi meo'.

But the wording in the Glastonbury charter has close parallels in numerous tenth-century charters (Eg. the Glastonbury charters S442, 462, 498, 504, 524, 568), and it is possible that the whole clause which follows the name of the beneficiary represents later redrafting.

This charter contains the earliest West Saxon example of an

immunity clause with all three of the exceptions which later became common. Interpolation of such a clause is not very likely, since it would have the effect of restricting the community's rights, and the immunity is consistent with developments in Wessex during the eighth and ninth centuries. An immunity with military service excepted occurs in a charter of Beorhtric of 794:-

S267: 'ut libertatem habeat omnium fiscalium negotiorum et operum Regalium et omnium rerum quae ad Villam Regiam pertinent nisi aquam (sic for unquam) expeditione sola quam omnes Comites ad tutelam totius Prouinciae et maxime Ecclesiarum Dei adire debent'.

His charter of 801 reserves military service and the construction of bridges:-

S282: 'Et hanc donationem ab omnibus terrenis difficultatibus liberabo extra expeditione et pontis factione'.

Against this background there seems little reason to doubt the authenticity of the Glastonbury clause:-

S270a: 'ab omni regali fisco liberam preter expeditionem et muniminis atque pontis operacionem libenter impendo'.

The dating clause is combined with a prohibitive clause beginning 'Sic perstringens ut ...' which is the only form of sanction included.

There has perhaps been some abbreviation here: it is likely that the text originally included other forms of the date besides the incarnational year which survives, and the sanction probably had a penal clause.

The verb perstringere, which does not occur in early charters but was used in text written in the tenth century, including some fabrications, tends to suggest that there has been some re-writing here (S110, 230, 560, 561, 563, 564, 568, 570, 582; Brooks 1984, p. 317).

The attestations appear to have been abbreviated since they consist only of '+Ego' with a name and title but no verb, which was a tenth-century practice, not an early one. But the names and titles seem to be genuine. 'Cynebirt circumspector ecclesiarum dei' and

'Whitberd episcopus' are presumably bishops Cyniberht of Winchester and Wigberht of Sherborne. The former is mentioned in the Chronicle as visiting Rome with Æthilheard, archbishop of Canterbury, in 801, and appears in charters of Beorhtric and Ecgfrith of Mercia (ASC s.a. 801; S149, 268, 269). Wigberht attests Beorhtric's charter of 801 and visited Rome in 814 (S268; ASC s.a. 814). Four laymen attest, 'Whytfer minister', 'Lulla prefectus', 'Whytbrord prefectus' and 'Osmund prefectus'. The first is probably to be identified with ealdorman Wigfrith, who appears prominently in the sources for this period: he appears in charters throughout the reigns of Cyniwulf and Beorhtric, was one of the avengers of Cyniwulf in 786, and may still have been active in the reign of Ecgberht (S96, 149, 261-264, 267-269; ASC s.a. 757; S278). Lulla was the beneficiary of Beorhtric's charter of 801, and Wiohtbrord attests the same charter. Osmund is otherwise unknown. The other witness of Eðburh's grant, 'Muca abbas', was abbot of Glastonbury: he appears in the abbatial list (as 'Luca'); is mentioned by William of Malmesbury as the beneficiary of a lost charter of king Ecgberht in 802, and attended the Council of Clofesho in 803 (S1693; B312).

The boundary clause which follows the witness list is in Old English, and therefore likely to be a later addition to the text, or possibly a translation of a Latin clause. Boundaries occur in two of Beorhtric's extant charters, but both are in Latin (S267, 268). The land granted to Eðdgils consisted of 20 hides at 'Buddekaulegh', now Butleigh in Somerset. The estate later came into Glastonbury's possession: it is mentioned in spurious pancartae of the house and was among Glastonbury's possessions in 1066 (S250, 783; DB Somerset, p. 8.12).

The charter, in spite of some later re-writing, seems to be substantially genuine, and is interesting since it is the only extant

charter in the name of a West Saxon queen, and includes the earliest instance in West Saxon charters of an immunity with the reservation of work on fortresses as well as the construction of bridges and military service.

* * * * *

Appendix: S264

British Library, Cotton Charter VIII 4.

(Edition: Ch.L. Ant., no. 194).

Cyniwulf's grant to the layman Bica of 13 hides at 'Bedewinde', now Little Bedwyn in Wiltshire, survives only on a single sheet of unknown provenance, now Cotton Charter VIII 4 in the British Library. The manuscript is in poor condition and there are several lacunae in the text. It has sometimes been considered an original or contemporary copy (Birch 1892; Stenton 1918a, p. 57 n. 6; Stenton 1971, p. 307 n. 1; EHD, p. 497; Ch. L. A., Part 3, no. 194. See also Rogers 1981, pp. 265-6), but Professor T. Julian Brown describes it as certainly of tenth-century date; the horned e and o, the form of a and the ur abbreviation which resembles a figure 2 are characteristic of tenth-century, but not earlier, scripts (Personal comment). The circumstances in which this copy was produced are unknown, but the charter seems to be genuine.

There is no motive for forgery of a grant to a layman, and the existence of Bica is confirmed by his appearance as the beneficiary of another grant by Cyniwulf of land at Mildenhall in Wiltshire, not far from Little Bedwyn; the charter is not now extant, but was included in Glastonbury's Liber Terrarum (LT 84) (S1682). The indications of date in the Little Bedwyn charter, 778 and the first indiction,

are consistent and suit the witness list. Bishops Æthilmod of Sherborne and Ecgbald of Winchester also attest Cyniwulf's charter of 774 (S263).

Four of the six ealdormen, prefecti, who subscribe are Scilling, Æthilnoth, Ceolberht and Æthilmund. A fifth name can be read as 'Hæmel ...' and is evidently Hemele, while the sixth is partly obscured so that only '... ferdes' is legible, but is probably Wigfrith. The name of the last witness, described as a comes of the king, is also obscured, but 'Fæd ...' can be read and the name may perhaps be Fædol ('Hæmel ...' was read under ultra-violet light, and 'Fæd ...' with the aid of a video spectral comparator. I should like to thank the staff of the Manuscript Conservation Department at the British Library for their assistance). All of the laymen except Fædol and ealdormen Ceolberht attest other charters of the reign, and the names appearing here fit the pattern which is apparent if the whole series of Cyniwulf's extant charters (all of which appear to be genuine) is considered. It is possible to see how the personnel of the king's entourage changes over the years as some men drop out, probably following death, retirement from public business, or loss of the king's favour, and are replaced by new ealdormen, counsellors or companions. (See next page).

There is no invocation or proem, and the text begins with the king's attestation, which is incorporated into the dispositio instead of being placed in the witness list. This unusual arrangement may indicate some redrafting of the text when the copy was made, although it is difficult to see any reason for this, and it is not impossible that the charter was originally drawn up in this way (cf. S1256).

In other respects the wording is quite normal. It is brief and simple, with no anachronistic clauses; the beneficiary is given the titles comes and minister, and the estate is granted to him and his heirs in perpetuity; the dating clause is of a common type, as is the sanction,

and the subscriptions are in the forms usual in early West Saxon charters.

The estate is described in a detailed boundary clause in Latin with Old English place-names. This is the earliest surviving example of such a detailed perambulation, but it need not be considered unprecedented or suspicious, since it is the logical outcome of earlier developments. There are brief boundaries in some of the earliest extant West Saxon charters, as already noted, and in every one of the charters of Cyniwulf there is some attempt to indicate the precise location of the estate. The intention appears to be the same in each case, although the methods vary. Different writers no doubt had different ideas of what should appear in a charter, and, moreover, what they wrote would necessarily reflect the form in which the information was given to them by the local people who knew the area and who alone could define estate boundaries. It is scarcely surprising that there is no clear, chronological development of increasing detail. The shortest example of a real boundary clause in the form of a perambulation appears in 758 (S265: the clause is in Old English, and may therefore be a later addition, but, in view of its brevity, it is perhaps more likely to be a translation of a genuine clause originally drawn up in Latin), a slightly longer one c. 766 (S262), and the first really detailed one in 778 in the present charter. But interspersed with these are charters in which descriptions of location, while clearly trying to improve on the vague methods of early charters, are still brief and inexact (S260, 261, 263). It seems likely that practical difficulties and disputes arose as a result of the vagueness of early descriptions of where estates lay, as is stated in Lulle's charter, and that the need to define the land precisely was realised in consequence of such problems, although the best method of doing this did not immediately become apparent. The problem was eventually solved in England and elsewhere by the inclusion

in charters of detailed accounts of the boundaries of estates. Earlier charters therefore provide a background against which the boundary clause of this text can be seen to be genuine, and its authenticity is further established by comparison with later charters. Two of the four which survive from the reign of Beorhtric (786-802) contain detailed boundary clauses in Latin and Old English similar to this one, and the second of these has been convincingly shown to be genuine since it begins and ends with an ancient form of a place-name, so there is no reason to suspect the authenticity of the others (S267, 268; Stenton 1955, p. 25).

The name 'Bedewinde' is used in early records for both Little Bedwyn and nearby Great Bedwyn, but the boundaries show that the estate granted to Bica was Little Bedwyn, and that this was directly adjacent to the estate of Great Bedwyn (Crawford 1921; Grundy 1919, pp. 151-5). At the beginning of the ninth century the two estates of Mildenhall and Little Bedwyn which had been granted to Bica were in the possession of a layman named Berhthelm, who may have been Bica's heir, and were given by him, with two other estates at Wootton Rivers and Froxfield not far away, to the see of Winchester in exchange for Farnham (S1263). By the mid-ninth century, Farnham had reverted to Winchester (S1274), and there is no evidence that the see retained any of Berhthelm's four estates. Mildenhall was evidently acquired by Glastonbury since the monastery held the charter granting this estate and owned the land in 1066 (DB Wiltshire, p. 7.7). Wootton Rivers passed into royal possession and was held by queen Edith in 1066 (Ibid., p. 1.15). Neither Little Bedwyn nor Froxfield occurs in any other pre-Conquest record, and neither is mentioned in Domesday Book. All other references to 'Bedewinde' before the Conquest relate to Great Bedwyn, which was a royal possession: king Ælfred owned it and bequeathed it to his

son, Edward; Eadgar granted it to Abingdon, but it was taken back into royal possession after his death, and was the property of king Edward in 1066 (S1507; S756, 937; DB Wiltshire, p. 1.2. The 'Bedewinde' mentioned in the Old English entries in the Berne Gospels was also probably Great Bedwyn: on these texts see EHD, p. 383 n. 11). There appears to have been some reorganisation of estates in the area between the ninth century and the eleventh: the four estates given by Berthelm to Winchester totalled 33 hides, but in 1066 Mildenhall was assessed at 10 hides and Wootton Rivers at 30. It is possible that Little Bedwyn came into Glastonbury's possession with Mildenhall, although it is not clear why one charter was copied into the Liber Terrarum and the other on to a single sheet, nor why the single sheet is not in the 1247 inventory. There is no evidence to suggest why a copy of the charter was required in the tenth century, and it is impossible to be certain whether this copy was made and preserved at Glastonbury or elsewhere.

* * * * *

(c) The Lost Charters

The lost charters of which some record survives are listed below in chronological order as far as this can be ascertained. For those not listed by Sawyer, numbers are given from Finberg's The Early Charters of Wessex, and these numbers are in brackets.

S	Date	Donor	Beneficiary	Property
-	601	king of Dumnonia	Glastonbury	5 hides at 'Inesuutrin'
1666	678	Centwine, king	Hæmgils, abbot	6 hides at Glastonbury
1665	-	Baldred	Hæmgils, abbot	fishery, R. Parrett
(358)	-	Baldred	Hæmgils, abbot	'Logworesbeorg'

S	Date	Donor	Beneficiary	Property
1667	-	Centwine, king	Wilfrid, bishop	Wedmore
1668	-	Centwine, king	?	Clewer in Wedmore
1669	-	Centwine, king	?	'Elosaneg'
1674	-	Wilfrid, bishop	Berhtwald, abbot	Wedmore
1675		Wilfrid, bishop	Glastonbury	1 hide at Clewer
1670	-	Ine, king	Berhtwald, abbot	foot of Mendip
(373)	-	Ine, king	Berhtwald, abbot	$\frac{1}{2}$ hide and fishery, 'Escford'
1672	-	Ine, king	Glastonbury	20 hides at Pilton
1673	-	Ine, king	Glastonbury	'Ora'
(632)	-	Bugu, abbess	Heahfrith, abbot	3 hides at 'Ora'
(377)	-	Ine, king	Heahfrith, abbot	1 hide and fishery, R. Axe
1676	729	Æthilheard, king	Glastonbury	10 hides, R. Torridge
1677	-	Frithugyth, queen	Glastonbury	5 hides at Brompton
1678	745	Cuthred, king	Tunberht, abbot	3 hides at 'Ure'
2679	746	Æthilbald, king	Tunberht, abbot	4 hides at 'Jecesig'
1680	756	Sigiberht, king	Tyccca, abbot	22 hides at 'Poholt'
1681	-	Cyniwulf, king	Æthilheard	3 hides at 'Cedern'
1682	-	Cyniwulf, king	Bica	Mildenhall
1683	-	Cyniwulf, king	Cuthberht	Culm Davy
1684	-	Cyniwulf, king	Guba, abbot	5 hides at Wootton
(390)	-	Cyniwulf, king	Guba, abbot	'Huneresburg'
1685	762	Cyniwulf, king	Wealdhun, abbot	5 hides at 'Cumtun'
1686	-	Cyniwulf, king	?	'Adamtone'
1687	-	Cyniwulf, king	?	Culmstock
1688	-	Cyniwulf, king	?	'Cynemersforda'
1689	-	Cyniwulf, king	?	'Honuton'
1690	-	Cyniwulf, king	?	'Mertone'
1691	-	Cuthberht	Sulce	Culmstock
1692	794	Offa, king	Beaduwulf, abbot	10 hides at 'Eswirht'
(397)	-	Offa, king	Æthilmund	1 hide at Huntspill
1693	802	Ecgerht, king	Glastonbury	near R. Torridge
(404)	824	Guthlac, abbot	Eanwulf	1 hide at 'Brunham'

The British Charter

DA, p. 88.

William of Malmesbury begins his account of grants to Glastonbury with one made by a king of Dumnonia of 5 hides at 'Inesuutrin', at the request of abbot Worgret. Two subscriptions are given in a form which suggests that the actual wording of the charter is being quoted: 'Ego Mauuron episcopus hanc cartam scripsi. Ego Worgret ieusdem loci abbas subscripsi'. William dates the charter 601 and states that the age of the document prevented identification of the king, by which he presumably meant that the condition of the manuscript rendered the name illegible.

The donor of this charter was clearly British, and Ineswitrin was the pre-Saxon name for Glastonbury (Gray 1935, p. 48). This charter therefore ought to form part of the corpus of Latin charter material originating in western Britain, Brittany and Ireland in the early medieval period, which has recently been shown to embody a distinct charter tradition (Davies 1982). But the surviving account of the charter shows none of the characteristics of that tradition, and two details in it are unlikely to have appeared in a genuine British charter. These are the statement of the amount of land granted as 5 hides, 'in quinque cassatis', since land is not quantified in this way in British charters, and the form of the subscriptions: British witness lists appear in the basic form 'testes sunt' plus a list of names, sometimes with titles (*Ibid.*, p. 266). The charter seems to correspond with the Anglo-Saxon rather than the 'Celtic' convention of charter writing.

Clearly this charter, if genuine, could not possibly belong to the Anglo-Saxon charter tradition if William of Malmesbury is even approximately right in his dating, since it pre-dates the conversion of Wessex and the production of the earliest West Saxon charters by many years, and relates to a British establishment at Glastonbury before

the Saxon monastery was founded there. Is it, therefore, possible that the charter was a forgery? The post-Conquest community at Glastonbury certainly fabricated documentary evidence to support the claims made about its early history, in the form of the 'Charter of St. Patrick' and other interpolations into the De Antiquitate. But the details of this charter do not suggest that it belongs to this corpus of fabricated material.

The persons involved are all otherwise unknown and the transaction which is recorded lends no support to any of the traditions connecting Glastonbury with early saints. There seems to be virtually no motive for forgery of this document, and the fact that William mentions the age of the manuscript and could not read the name of the donor suggests that he saw a very early original: it is most unusual for William to have difficulty in reading a document.

It may be that the charter was genuine and that the explanation for the unexpectedly Saxon appearance of some of the details in the surviving account is that William of Malmesbury was accustomed to dealing with Anglo-Saxon charters, and therefore followed a basically Anglo-Saxon format in recording this grant. Much of the wording is simply his own account of the grant, and in no sense a transcription of the charter, and the subscription forms which he appears to quote may be his own improvement of the simple attestations of his exemplar. He appears to have rephrased Theodore's subscription in the charter in Coenwalh's name, 'Ego Theodorus subscripsi' in his account, 'Signum manus Theodori archiepiscopi' in the cartulary version (DA, p. 90; cf. S227), and his reporting of witness lists, which he evidently considered unimportant, is often inaccurate (As may be seen by comparing his transcripts of Malmesbury charters in the Gesta Pontificum with the cartulary versions). The reference to 5 hides could result from substitution of the familiar term 'cassati' for an unfamiliar word such as 'uncias' or 'modii', which

are the measurements used in the Llandaff charters (Davies 1978, p. 83). Another record of a grant by a king of Dumnonia also refers to hides: 'Gerontius rex dedit Macuir de . u . hidis iuxta Thamar' (ECDC, no. 72), but again this may be a substitution by a scribe accustomed to this unit of measurement, or it may be that this grant, made to a Saxon community, was recorded in normal Saxon terms.

On the whole, the probability seems to be that this charter was genuine. The names seem odd, but may be miscopied since the exemplar was difficult to read. The dubious details can be accounted for, and motive for forgery is lacking. Archaeological evidence shows that a pre-Saxon monastery existed on the site of Glastonbury (Taylor 1965-78, p. 254), and the survival of a charter belonging to it suggests that there was some sort of continuity between the British and Saxon houses, since it seems likely that the document would not have survived a total cessation of monastic life at Glastonbury.

Sl666 LT 1

The charter which was placed first in the Liber Terrarum is described in the contents list as 'Carta Kenwini de insula Glastonie'. William of Malmesbury adds that it was a grant to abbot Hæmgils dated 678 of 6 hides which were given 'liberas ob omni servicio' (DA, p. 90). This last detail is suspicious since no genuine surviving West Saxon charter of the seventh century specifies that the grant is immune from secular burdens, and it seems likely that when Ine made a general grant of this privilege in 704 (S245) he was introducing a measure new to Wessex and modelled on Kentish practice. Immunities begin to be specified in individual West Saxon charters only in the mid-eighth century (S255). In this instance the phrase may well relate to the later special status of Glastonbury Twelve Hides, but it is not proof of fabrication, since

it could have been interpolated into a genuine charter.

Since the grant is of Glastonbury itself, it would be natural to assume that it was a foundation charter, and its position at the beginning of the Liber Terrarum tends to endorse this view. But William of Malmesbury says nothing to suggest that this was the case, and it is not likely that he would have omitted to mention such a circumstance. Moreover, in his account this charter follows the grant by Coenwalh dated 670 (S227) and William does not suggest that the evidence presented any problem as it would have done if Centwine's charter had been worded as a foundation charter. It therefore appears to have been simply a grant of land at Glastonbury, and may well have been authentic, since there seems to have been virtually no motive for forgery: ownership of the actual site and immediate environs of the monastery is not likely ever to have been disputed; the area of land is small; and the king mentioned as donor was not particularly famous.

The grant fits the context of other evidence. It is likely, as William says (DA, p. 88), that the pagan Saxons seized the lands of British monasteries and that these lands were restored after the conversion. This grant could be one such restoration, and it is possible that the estate included all or part of what which was the subject of the British charter discussed above. The evidence of authentic charters, both extant and lost, is that the earliest Saxon kings to make grants to Glastonbury were Centwine and his contemporary, Baldred, and that the earliest abbot of the Saxon monastery was Hæmgils. It was the tradition of the house that Hæmgils was appointed by Centwine (S236), and this could well have been correct. This lost charter may have been an authentic document recording a grant of land in the immediate vicinity of Glastonbury made when, or shortly after, the monastery was first established as a Saxon house.

Sl665 LT 13 IC A2

A charter in which Baldred granted a fishery on the river Parrett was included in the Liber Terrarum and is mentioned by William of Malmesbury (DA, p. 90). It was probably authentic. Baldred is an obscure figure but is known to have been a benefactor of the house, and fabrication of a charter granting a fishery seems unlikely, since it appears that at a later date such charters were considered unimportant: none was transcribed into the Great Chartulary, although in the present case the document existed as a single sheet in 1247 and was then classified as relating to property still owned by Glastonbury, and more than one grant of a fishery was omitted by the compiler of the Liber Terrarum (ECW, nos. 373, 377). The situation of the property is unknown. William of Malmesbury, in his summary of Glastonbury's possessions, mentions the place-name 'Westwere' (DA, p. 140), but this is unidentified. It must have been at least 12 miles from Glastonbury, this being the distance to the nearest section of the Parrett. There seems little reason to doubt that this charter recorded a genuine grant by Baldred.

ECW 338

William of Malmesbury includes among the lands granted by Baldred 16 hides at 'Logworesbeorh', listed in the summary of possessions as 'Loggaresbeorg, id est Muntagu' (DA, pp. 90, 140). This grant is recorded nowhere else, but the Liber Terrarum contents list mentions a grant of 'Logderesdone, i. Montagu' by 'Tumbeard episcopus', presumably the ninth-century bishop Tunberht of Winchester (Sl703), which is unrecorded elsewhere. Montacute occurs in other Glastonbury records only as a possession of Glastonbury at the time of Æthelwulf's decimation (S303). It was not owned by Glastonbury in 1066. Bishop Tunberht's charter was probably genuine, because the Glastonbury community is not likely

to have invented a grant by a bishop of Winchester. It is possible that there was also a grant by Baldred, but the source of William's information is unknown, and may not have been reliable. It is far from certain that he saw a charter of Baldred, and it is impossible to know whether an authentic document lies behind his statement.

S1667 IC C1 and S1674 IC C2

Two charters which survived as single sheets in 1247 but were not included in the Liber Terrarum record Centwine's grant of 'Wethmor', now Wedmore, to bishop Wilfrid, and Wilfrid's grant of the same estate to abbot Berhtwald of Glastonbury. The inventory actually names the original donor as 'Kenelm', but Cynehelm of Mercia was not the contemporary of any bishop named Wilfrid, and William of Malmesbury states that the donor was Centwine (DA, p. 94). He also mentions that the estate was of 70 hides and lay on an island. The modern village is among low hills about 7 miles north-west of Glastonbury.

The charters are listed in the inventory as relating to land not still owned by Glastonbury, and this is confirmed by other records. In the late ninth century the estate belonged to king Ælfred, who bequeathed it to his eldest son, and it apparently came into the possession of the see of Wells later (S1507; S1042, 1115; DB Somerset, pp. 1.2, 6.15). It appears that the land passed out of the possession of Glastonbury at an early date, and therefore that there was no motive for forgery of these charters.

The only recorded contact between Centwine and Wilfrid occurred when the latter sought, but was refused, asylum in Wessex after his expulsion from Northumbria by king Ecgfrith (Colgrave, Wilfrid, ch. XL, p. 80). No doubt Centwine did not wish to provoke Northumbrian hostility by harbouring a Northumbrian exile. Nothing in the course

of events at this time precludes the possibility of amicable relations between Centwine and Wilfrid at an earlier date, and there seems little reason to doubt the authenticity of the king's charter. Wilfrid's later grant to abbot Berhtwald is also likely to have been genuine.

Sl668 IC A17 and Sl675 LT 10 IC A20

Two charters listed in 1247 as grants to Glastonbury of lands still owned are described as 'Cenewre rex de Clifwere' and 'Wilferfus rex de Cliwere. inutilis'. The latter was still quite legible when the Liber Terrarum was compiled, and appears in the contents list as 'Wilfridus episcopus de Clifuuere. G.'. Both charters are included in the inventory among a group represented as grants to abbot Ealdberht, but that grouping is erroneous and may be disregarded. William of Malmesbury confirms that Wilfrid granted to Glastonbury 'villam de Cliwere i hidam' (DA, p. 94), but does not mention the other grant, nor does this appear in the Liber Terrarum contents list. The probability seems to be, as has been suggested, that these transactions were similar to those involving Wedmore, and that the first charter was a grant of Centwine to Wilfrid (ECW, no. 363; Sl668).

'Cliwere' is now Clewer, a small village 2 miles north of Wedmore. The name does not occur elsewhere in Glastonbury records or pre-Conquest charters. In 1066 the estate was held by the bishop of Coutances (DB Somerset, p. 5.19), and the inclusion of these charters among grants of land still owned in 1247 was almost certainly erroneous. It is probably because the land was not retained by Glastonbury that the charters have not survived. They are likely to have been authentic.

Sl669 LT 4

The Liber Terrarum included a charter of Centwine granting

'Elosaneg' to a layman, and William of Malmesbury mentions 'Elonsanige' in a list of places granted by kings to their followers, and by them to Glastonbury (DA, p. 144). The place-name does not occur elsewhere in Glastonbury records or pre-Conquest charters and is unidentified, and the identity of the beneficiary is unknown. Consequently the evidence tells us virtually nothing, although the charter is likely to have been genuine since there appears to have been no motive for forgery.

Sl670 IC A6

Among Ine's grants to abbot Berhtwald was one of 'terra ad pedem de Munedup'. The charter survived in 1247 and the land was said to be owned by Glastonbury at that time, but the charter was not included in either the Liber Terrarum or the Great Chartulary, and the grant is not mentioned by William of Malmesbury. The charter may have been disregarded either because the estate could not be identified, or because there was later documentation naming the estate which rendered this charter obsolete and valueless (It is possible, for example, that the estate was Batcombe, described by William of Malmesbury as 'Badecumbe iuxta montem de Munidop': DA, p. 152). It is likely to have been genuine, since a forger would have provided a clearer account of the estate.

ECW 373

A grant of Ine to abbot Berhtwald of $\frac{1}{2}$ hide and a fishery at 'Escford' is mentioned only by William of Malmesbury (DA, p. 94). Finberg plausibly suggests that 'Escford' was a ford on the river Axe. A grant of the same property was also attributed to Eadmund (Sl723), but this may have been conformation of an earlier grant. Theoretically, fabrication of Ine's charter is possible, but it seems doubtful whether the property would justify the trouble.

Sl672 LT 9

The Liber Terrarum included a charter of Ine granting to Glastonbury an estate at Pilton. The problem here, as already mentioned in connection with extant charters of Ine, is of sorting out which record relates to which estate. An authentic charter of Ine grants lands including 20 hides on the river 'Duluting', now the Sheppey, and a later version of this charter includes bounds which indicate that the estate included Pilton (S248, 247). Therefore the same estate might be known as either Doulting or Pilton, and it is possible that the grant of Pilton in the Liber Terrarum and the grant of Doulting in the 1247 inventory (IC A5) are in fact the same grant, and that each entry relates to the Doulting charter (As ~~Smyer~~ suggests: Sl672). William attributes to Ine two separate grants each of 20 hides at Doulting and Pilton (DA, p. 94), but this could be an error arising from the use of two different names for the same estate.

On the other hand, Glastonbury did in later years own two separate estates, each of 20 hides, one at Doulting and one at Pilton, and these appear in Domesday Book (DB Somerset, pp. 8.23, 8.20). It may be that Ine granted both and that the Liber Terrarum record is of a lost charter, although it is not easy to see why the charter should have been discarded. It is impossible to be certain whether there is a lost charter here, and, if there is, whether it was genuine.

Sl673 LT 12 and ECW 632

The Liber Terrarum included a charter in which Ine granted 'Oram' to Glastonbury. This is not recorded elsewhere, but William of Malmesbury mentions that an abbess named Bugu granted 3 hides at 'Ora' to abbot 'Echfrid' (DA, p. 94). In the later summary of Glastonbury possessions, but not in William's main narrative, it is stated that Bugu's grant

was made with the consent and confirmation of Ine (Ibid., p. 142). 'Ora', of which 'Oram' is presumably an accusative case, is unidentified. The grant of abbess Bugu is likely to have been genuine, since no forger would have selected such a donor. The grant of Ine is more dubious. It is possible that a charter in his name was fabricated to replace that of Bugu, or that the charter included in the Liber Terrarum was actually that of Bugu and that it is misrepresented, either by accident or design, in the surviving contents list.

The abbess Bugu is possibly to be identified with Bugge, the daughter of king Centwine, who was abbess of a double monastery during Ine's reign (Ehwald, pp. 14-8), but the identification is far from certain since it seems likely that any woman with a name ending in -burh might have been called by this short name, which was therefore probably common. Identification with Boniface's correspondent, abbess Heahburh, called Bucge, seems less likely (Tangl, nos. 14, 15, 27, 94, 105, 117). The name of the abbot, which appears as 'Echfrid' and 'Eethfrido' (DA, pp. 94, 102) has been interpreted as Heahfrith, and he has been tentatively identified with Aldhelm's correspondent of the same name (Cook 1927, pp. 370-1; cf. Lapidge 1982a, p. 180 n. 11). The dates fit well enough, but there is insufficient evidence to prove the identification, which remains merely a possibility.

ECW 377

Ine's grant to abbot Heahfrith, recorded only by William of Malmesbury, was of 1 hide and a fishery on the Axe (DA, p. 94). William details this as a separate grant from the 'Escford' one, made to a different abbot, and it is virtually impossible, knowing how carefully William worked, that this is merely a duplication. Like the earlier one, this is likely to have been a genuine charter.

Sl676 LT 29 and Sl693 LT 30

Two charters in the Liber Terrarum related to land at 'Torric', identified as an estate in the valley of the river Torridge in Devon. The first is a grant by Æthilheard to Glastonbury, and William of Malmesbury adds that the estate was of 10 hides (DA ., p. 102). The second is described in the contents list as a charter of Ecgerht concerning the liberty of the same estate, and by William of Malmesbury as a grant of 5 hides for the use of the monks, made at the request of abbot Muca in 802 ((Ibid, p. 110). The estate does not occur elsewhere in Glastonbury records or pre-Conquest charters and was not owned by Glastonbury in 1066. Forgery of title-deeds for such a remote estate, not apparently owned at a later date, seems improbable, and these charters are likely to have been genuine. The reference to abbot Muca also suggests that Ecgerht's charter was authentic, since this is William's only reference to this abbot, but he is recorded as a witness of charters of 801 and 803 (S270a; B312). Ecgerht's grant was probably a confirmation of Æthilheard's, perhaps adding an immunity, hence the reference to 'libertas' in the Liber Terrarum contents list, or may have restored land which the monastery had lost. It is also possible that a different, adjoining estate was granted. The different hideage could be an error or might represent a change of circumstances.

Sl677 LT 16

Æthilheard's queen, Frithugyth, is recorded as granting to Glastonbury an estate at 'Brunamtone', identified as Brompton, Somerset. The only places of the name in Somerset are Brompton Ralph and Brompton Regis, both far to the west, but it is not implausible that Frithugyth should grant land in that area since Æthilheard granted an estate in Devon. Glastonbury is not recorded elsewhere as owning the estate, so there

seems to have been no motive for forgery. A grant by this queen is consistent with her regular appearance in the charters of this reign, and it seems likely that the charter was genuine.

In William's summary the queen's name is given erroneously as 'Bedeswitha' (DA, p. 142). Since the second element of the name has here been mistranscribed as -swith, the same error could have occurred elsewhere, and it may therefore be that a miscopying of Frithugyth in some form approximating to Frithuswith lies behind the modern form 'Frideswide', and that Frithugyth of Wessex is the saint of Oxford. But this remains only a possibility, and it is more likely that Frideswide was someone else who did bear the name Frithuswith. The element Frith- is not particularly uncommon .

Sl678 LT 18

Cuthred is recorded as granting 'Ure' to Glastonbury. According to William of Malmesbury, the estate was of 3 hides and the beneficiary was abbot Tunberht, who is also the recipient of Lulle's charter (DA, p. 104; Sl410). The estate is unidentified and unrecorded elsewhere. The charter was probably genuine.

Sl679 LT 22 and 94

Two entries in the Liber Terrarum contents list read:-

'Æthelbaldus de Sceacescet & Bradanleag. S.'

and

'Æthelbaldus de Jecesig & Bradraleah dat. G.'.

These appear to relate to two versions of the same document. William of Malmesbury gives some of the wording of the charter, which he dates to 746:-

ego Aethelbald, pro redempcione anime mee, Tumberto,
IX annos presidenti, et familie que in monasterio
Glastongabirie fideli Deo famulantur obsequio largitus
sum, precio cccc solidorum, iiii hidas, duobus in
locis, Jecesig et Bradanleghe (DA, p. 104)

A grant to Glastonbury by Æthilbald at this time is consistent with other evidence, notably his confirmation of Lulle's charter of 744. Tunberht was the beneficiary of Lulle's grant and of the grant of Cuthred just discussed. The wording preserved by William of Malmesbury, notably the clause underlined above, suggests that Æthilbald's charter belonged to the group of mid-eighth-century charters jointly discussed above. The description of the beneficiaries, who are the abbot and community, also closely resembles the descriptions in those charters, and Æthilbald's charter, like Lulle's, mentions the price paid for the land.

The place-names are not mentioned elsewhere and are unidentified, although Finberg suggests that 'Bradandleghe' could be West Bradley, 4 miles east of Glastonbury (ECW, no. 634). It seems probable that Æthilbald's charter was genuine.

S1680 LT 63

The contents list of the Liber Terrarum records that Sigiberht granted 'Poolt' to Glastonbury. William of Malmesbury adds a considerable amount of detail to this statement. The grant was made to abbot Tyccea and the monks of Glastonbury in 754, the area of land was 22 hides and a price of 50 gold solidi was paid. Tyccea also purchased from Sigiberht a further 6 hides to the west of the estate, and for this too 50 gold solidi were paid (DA, p. 104). The date 754 presumably derives from the Chronicle with its two-year dislocation, and is probably William's dating of the evidence, introduced to correct what would appear to him to be an error or omission in the charter. The date of a grant of Sigiberht can only be 756 or 757.

The charter is likely to have been genuine. Sigiberht is an unlikely choice for a forger. Abbot Tyccea attests a charter of 757 and William of Malmesbury read the inscription on his tomb at Glastonbury (S96; DA, p. 106). The charter evidently resembled others of the mid-eighth century in being expressed as a grant to the abbot and his community: the wording is different here, 'Tican abbati et monachis in urbe Glastingsium degentibus', but the idea is much the same. There are also contemporary parallels for the statement of price, and the account of the purchase of the other 6 hides is an unlikely invention, although it is odd that the price is the same for 6 hides as for 22.

S1681 LT 31 IC D4

The Liber Terrarum contents list includes a grant of land by Cyniwulf to a layman, Aethilheard, who is otherwise unknown, with a note that the beneficiary passed the property to Glastonbury. William of Malmesbury records the charter as a grant by Aethilheard to Glastonbury (DA, p. 106), in accordance with his standard method of dealing with grants to laymen surviving in the Glastonbury archives. In the 1247 inventory the charter is listed among grants to laymen of lands no longer held by Glastonbury.

The estate is called 'Elenbearo' in the contents list, and 'Cedern' with the addition of 'id est Elenbeorge' by William. It is identified as Elborough, about a mile from Hutton, near Weston-super-Mare. The estate was owned by Glastonbury in 1066, but by the bishop of Coutances in 1086 ((DB Somerset, pp. 8.38, 5.11). The area granted by Cyniwulf was 3 hides (DA, p. 106), and the estate was assessed at the same amount in 1086. Glastonbury evidently retained an interest in this land for many years, but the charter of Cyniwulf is most unlikely to have been forged since a forger would not have drawn up a grant to a layman.

The charter was therefore probably authentic.

S1682 LT 84

A grant by Cyniwulf to the layman, Bica, of an estate at 'Mildenhealh', now Mildenhall in Wiltshire, is recorded only in the contents list of the Liber Terrarum. William of Malmesbury must have missed it for some reason, but he mentions a charter which was probably a grant by king Eadgar to a layman named Ealdred and included 15 hides at Mildenhall, and which does not appear elsewhere (DA, p. 130). Cyniwulf's grant of Mildenhall is discussed in connection with his other grant to Bica above (S264). The charter was probably genuine, as fabrication of a grant to an obscure layman is unlikely.

S1683 LT 25; S1687 LT 24 IC D2; S1691 LT 26

Three consecutive entries in the contents list of the Liber Terrarum read as follows:-

Cyniwulf de culum. S.
Idem de Cumbe juxta Culum dat. Cuthberto. S.
Cuthberto de Culum dat. Sulco, qui dedit Glast.

'Culum' is now Culmstock, and 'Cumbe' is Culm Davy, both in Devon. William of Malmesbury does not mention Cuthberht, but attributes to Sulce, 'Christi ancilla', the grant to Glastonbury of both estates in the reign of Cyniwulf (DA, p. 106). The only one of these charters to survive as a single sheet in 1247 was Cyniwulf's grant of Culmstock, which was classified as a grant to a layman of land no longer owned. A grant by king Eadred to a layman, also included in the Liber Terrarum but not now extant, related to 'Cumbe' which is perhaps Culm Davy. This is the only other appearance of this name in Glastonbury records, and the estate is not mentioned in any extant pre-Conquest charter. Culmstock is named in the decimation charter (S303), but by the eleventh

century, and probably earlier, was claimed by Exeter (S386). Neither estate was owned by Glastonbury in 1066.

Down to and including entry no. 24, the compiler of the contents list did not name beneficiaries other than Glastonbury. He named the lay recipient of no. 25, probably because he saw that the obscure donor of no. 26 was the same person, so that the latter entry would be clarified by naming the beneficiary of no. 25. It seems likely that both of Cyniwulf's grants were to Cuthberht, since he is said in no. 26 to own the estate granted to the unnamed beneficiary, and because the grants to Bica provide a parallel for two grants by Cyniwulf to the same man of two neighbouring estates.

The assertion that Sulce granted the land to Glastonbury could be mere assumption, but is perhaps likely to be right because it is otherwise difficult to account for the presence in the Glastonbury archives of a grant to her. She was evidently a nun, and would not therefore deposit documents at Glastonbury for safe-keeping as a lay-person might have done, but would keep them at her own monastery. The inclusion of Culmstock among Glastonbury lands mentioned in the decimation charter also suggests that the estate did come into the possession of Glastonbury.

The grant of Culm Davy to Cuthberht could have been a deposit, but it is probably more likely that this related charter came into Glastonbury's possession with the others, and that Glastonbury acquired both estates. None of this is certain because the evidence is so fragmentary, and William's version is not entirely supported by the details in the contents list. The charters seem to have been authentic because there is no apparent motive for forgery, but there remains some doubt as to what they said and what was the history of the estates.

Sl684 LT 27

A charter in the Liber Terrarum is described as a grant by Cyniwulf to Glastonbury of 5 hides of land. The estate is not named. William mentions two grants by Cyniwulf to Glastonbury of estates of 5 hides; one, a grant of 'Cumtun' is no 39 in the Liber Terrarum contents list (Sl685); the other is probably to be identified with this charter.

It is a grant to abbot Guba dated 760, and the estate is called 'Wudeton' (DA, p. 106), a name of which the modern form is Wootton. Finberg suggests that this may have been North Wootton about 4 miles north-west of Glastonbury, which was an estate of 5 hides and was held by Glastonbury in 1066 (ECW, no. 389; DB Somerset, p. 8.20).

Abbot Guba is recorded only by William of Malmesbury as the recipient of this and another grant (ECW, no. 390). The charter was probably genuine. The fact that it apparently did not name the estate is a point in its favour, since it probably had the sort of vague description which is typical of genuine early charters and does not appear in forgeries.

ECW 390

The other grant to abbot Guba is mentioned only by William and was of 'Huneresberg' on the east bank of the Parrett (DA, p. 106). The place-name, modernised as Houndsborough, was at one time the name of the hundred but does not now survive except as Houndston. It is not mentioned elsewhere in Glastonbury records or pre-Conquest charters, or as an estate in Domesday Book. There is no reason to think that the land was owned by Glastonbury at a later date, or that there was ever a motive for forgery of a grant relating to it, and Cyniwulf's charter was probably genuine.

S1685 LT 39

The Liber Terrarum included a charter in which Cyniwulf granted 'Cumtone' to Glastonbury, and William mentions this as a grant to abbot Wealdhun dated 762, the area of land being 5 hides (Ibid., p. 106). The modern form of the place-name is Compton, and Finberg suggests that the estate may have been Compton Dundon, a few miles south of Glastonbury where the monastery held an estate of 5 hides in 1066 (ECW, no. 393; DB Somerset, p. 8.11). The abbot is included in the abbatial list and the charter was probably genuine.

S1686 IC D1

The first charter listed in the 1247 inventory's category of grants to laymen of lands no longer held is described as 'Cenwulf de Aldamtone & quibusdam alliis'. This is followed by three other charters cited as grants by the same king, 'Idem de ...'. two of which are included in the Liber Terrarum contents list, the donor there being named as 'Cyniuulf' and 'Cyneuulfus' (S1687, 1681). It therefore appears that all four charters were grants of Cyniwulf of Wessex, and not Coenwulf of Mercia who might equally have been indicated by the name as it appears in list D of the inventory.

William mentions this and some other charters from list D only in a paragraph which follows the summary of Glastonbury possessions and in which he names various estates given to Glastonbury without detailing the grants. He therefore adds nothing to the information of the inventory. The estate may have been Alhampton, about 8 miles south-west of Glastonbury, which was owned by Glastonbury in 1066 (ECW, no. 396; DB Somerset, p. 8.30). It is not named elsewhere in Glastonbury records or pre-Conquest charters. There was probably a genuine charter of Cyniwulf granting the estate to a layman, but we do not know who the beneficiary was

or how Glastonbury acquired the land.

S1688 IC D3

Another grant by Cyniwulf to an unnamed layman is included in list D, and the estate is mentioned by William in the paragraph referred to above. The estate, 'Cynemersforda', is unidentified, although Finberg tentatively suggests Quemerford in Calne, Wiltshire, or Kempsford, Gloucestershire, as possible identifications (ECW, no. 636). The charter may well have been genuine but the surviving information is so limited as to be worthless.

S1689 LT 47

In the contents list of the Liber Terrarum an entry reading 'Item Cenwlf de eodem S' follows an account of a grant by king Eadred to a layman of land at 'Horutone' which the beneficiary's heir gave to Glastonbury (S1743). It is not known which Horton these charters related to. This is therefore another grant of an unidentified estate to an unnamed layman, and in this case it is impossible even to be certain who the donor was: it may have been Cyniwulf of Wessex or Coenwulf of Mercia.

S1690 IC B1

Another charter whose donor may have been Cyniwulf or Coenwulf is listed as 'Cenwlfus de Mertone' among charters extant in 1247 relating to grants to laymen of lands still owned by Glastonbury. The grant is not mentioned by William of Malmesbury. The estate may have been Merton in Surrey which is the subject of extant Glastonbury charters (S551, 747). Finberg suggests as an alternative Compton Martin, Somerset, which is considerably nearer to Glastonbury, but makes no

appearance in Glastonbury records and is mentioned in a spurious pancarta of Wells (ECW, no. 635; S1042). The identity of the beneficiary is not recorded, so we know virtually nothing of this charter.

S1692 LT 28

A single charter of Offa is listed among the contents of the Liber Terrarum. It is represented there as a grant to an unspecified layman, but William of Malmesbury records it as a grant to abbot Beaduwulf of Glastonbury (DA, p. 106), and it seems likely that the compiler of the contents list failed to recognise this man as an abbot. He is recorded by William as one of the witnesses of Coenwulf's confirmation of pope Leo's privilege (S152). William dates Offa's charter 794, four years before the privilege.

The estate appears in the Liber Terrarum contents list as 'Inesuuyrth juxta Hunespulle', but William says it was 'in Eswirht x hidas' (DA, p. 106). Evidently there is a scribal error in one version, but it is impossible to be certain which, as the name does not survive. 'Hunespulle', however, is modern Huntspill, several miles west of Glastonbury, near to the mouth of the Parrett, so the approximate location of the estate is known. It is not recorded elsewhere, and was apparently not owned by Glastonbury at a later date. There seems no reason to doubt that the charter was authentic.

ECW 397

Another charter involving Offa and relating to a neighbouring estate is recorded only by William: 'Ethelmund assensu regis Offe dedit Hunespulle i hidam' (DA, p. 106). A comparison of William's narrative with extant charters and other records shows that he habitually recorded charters which were grants by kings to laymen as grants by the laymen

to Glastonbury with the kings' consent. In this instance it is not impossible that Æthilmund made a grant to Glastonbury, but it is far more likely that Finberg is right in assuming that the charter William saw was a grant by Offa to Æthilmund. It is likely to have been genuine. There was no motive for forgery of a grant to a layman, and Glastonbury did not claim to own Huntspill at a later date. Æthilmund is probably to be identified with the ealdorman of the Hwicce, mentioned in the Chronicle, and also known from a number of charters (ASC s.a. 802; S58, 59, 139, 149).

ECW 404

William of Malmesbury records a sale by abbot Guthlac to Eanwulf of part of a hide at 'Brunham' in 824 (DA, p. 110). The abbot is included in the tenth-century abbatial list but is otherwise unknown. Eanwulf was, or later became, ealdorman of Somerset, and appears in charters of the reign of Æthelwulf, including a Glastonbury charter of which he is the beneficiary (ASC s.a. 845; S292). The land mentioned in this transaction is unidentified, although Finberg tentatively suggests that it may have been Brompton Ralph which was held by Glastonbury in 1066 (ECW, no. 404; DB Somerset, p. 25.7). The estate was sold to Eanwulf for 500 shillings of which 200 were paid to the abbot and 300 to the monks. As this is a record of an alienation, not an acquisition, of land, there is no motive for forgery, which suggests that the account is likely to be accurate. The source could have been a charter deposited at Glastonbury for safe-keeping by Eanwulf, or the monastery may have acquired the charter with the land.

(d) General Conclusions

The cartulary of Glastonbury, like others from major West Saxon abbeys, has been regarded in the past with considerable suspicion, as a glance through the comments collected by Sawyer will show, and this attitude still persists. As recently as 1981 the editor of the De Antiquitate stated that 'it is quite clear that many of its charters are later forgeries', citing the judgements of earlier scholars in support of this conclusion (DA, pp. 2, 174 n. 20), and even more recently two Glastonbury charters which, there is good reason to believe, are based on authentic material although interpolated in their extant forms, have been described as 'patent forgeries' (S236, 246; Lapidge 1982a, p. 183 n. 24).

Examination of the early charters conspicuously fails to provide justification for this view. Of a total of 18 charters surviving from the period down to 839, 14 are probably substantially genuine (S236, 237, 1249, 238, 248, 1253, 251, 253, 1410, 257, 264, 152, 270a and the papal privilege, DA, p. 108). In many cases the texts have been altered or interpolated, but it usually seems that this has been done in order to improve or modernise the documents, and not with any fraudulent purpose. of the 4 remaining documents, one is a version of a genuine privilege of general application made to refer to Glastonbury alone, and is therefore spurious as it stands, but is modelled on and substantially reproduces the text of the genuine charter, and adds nothing but the implication that Glastonbury was particularly privileged (S246, cf. S245). Another is a copy of a genuine charter, drawn up to relate to only one of a number of estates originally granted and cannot have been produced for any fraudulent purpose as it claims nothing which the genuine charter does not include (S247, cf. S248). Only two of all the early charters are undoubted fabrications (S227, 250).

The later charters are not examined here, but a glance at them

suggests that they too fail to justify any general condemnation of the Glastonbury archives. There are 46 charters dated to the period between the death of Ecgberht in 839 and the Conquest. Of these 31 are grants to lay-persons (S270a, 288, 292, 341, 347, 399, 426, 431, 442, 462, 472, 473, 474, 481, 498, 504, 509, 513, 524, 530, 541, 551, 555, 563, 570, 580, 644, 721, 742, 747, 775) and therefore likely, as a group, to be genuine, as noted above, since motive for forgery is lacking; and there is no obvious reason for doubting the authenticity of several of the others, so it seems that the number of fabrications is very small.

The low reputation of an archive in which fabrications represent only a very small proportion of the charter material is perhaps to be accounted for by the fact that when the Glastonbury community did apply itself to the fabrication of charters, it did so in no half-hearted manner, and produced forgeries of the most flagrant description. Prominent among these is the notorious 'Charter of St. Patrick', recently described as 'superbly spurious' (B1; Lapidge 1982a, p. 183 n. 24), and there is a series of privileges in the names of Ine, Eadmund, Eadgar, and Knútr (S250, 499, 783, 966). Those of Ine and Eadgar are fabrications and the other two are very dubious, probably interpolated if not fabricated. It is not very surprising that these documents have attracted attention and that the community and the archive have been judged accordingly, but the persistence of this attitude to Glastonbury casts unfounded suspicion on a considerable body of genuine, early charters.

2. MALMESBURY

	<u>Page</u>
(a) <u>Introduction</u>	128
(b) <u>The Abbatial List</u>	131
(c) <u>The Charters</u>	135

S

1245 Leuthere, bishop, to Aldhelm, priest	136
1166 Coenfrith, comes, to Aldhelm, abbot	140
71)) Æthilred, king, to Aldhelm, abbot	144
73)	
1169 Berhtwald, sub-king, to Aldhelm, abbot	149
1170 Baldred to Aldhelm, abbot	152
231)) Ceadwalla, king, to the church	156
234)	
- Sergius I, pope, to Aldhelm, abbot	161
243 Ine, king, to West Saxon churches	169
245 Ine, king, to West Saxon churches	173
- Aldhelm, bishop, to Malmesbury	186
256 Cuthred, king, to Malmesbury	189
260 Cyniwulf, king, to Malmesbury	194
149 Ecgfrith, king, to Cuthberht, abbot	196

Appendix

96 Æthilbald, king, to Eanberht, abbot	201
(d) <u>Conclusions</u>	205

(a) Introduction

Most of the early charters of Malmesbury survive in four manuscripts. The earliest of these is the autograph manuscript of William of Malmesbury's Gesta Pontificum dating from c. 1125, Magdalen College 172, now in the Bodleian. Book 5 of this work, devoted to a life of Aldhelm and a history of the monastery at Malmesbury, included numerous transcriptions of charters to illustrate the narrative. The other three manuscripts are cartularies of Malmesbury. The earliest of them, Bodleian Wood empt. 5 (Davis 1958, no. 641), dating from the thirteenth century, is a handsome volume written in a large, clear book-hand, and contains copies of charters in chronological order from the seventh century down to the reign of Stephen. Manuscript E 163/24 in the Public Record Office (Davis 1958, no. 644), a manuscript of the late thirteenth century, duplicates the contents of the earlier volume and includes a quantity of other material relating to the post-Conquest period. The contents of British Library, Lansdowne 417 (Davis 1958, no. 645), dating from the late fourteenth or early fifteenth century, are largely the same as those of the Public Record Office manuscript.

Bodleian, Wood empt. 5 is the only one of these manuscripts which has never been edited. An edition of the Gesta Pontificum was produced by N.E.S.A. Hamilton for the Rolls Series (GP). The Public Record Office manuscript was chosen by J.S. Brewer as the basis of his edition of the Malmesbury cartulary (Brewer, Malmesbury Cart.). And British Library, Lansdowne 417, although never edited in full, was used by Birch in preparing transcripts of the Malmesbury charters for the Cartularium Saxonicum (B). The three cartularies include the same pre-Conquest charters in the same order, and their texts closely correspond. Errors and omissions in the Public Record Office manuscript recur in the British

Library volume. It may be tentatively suggested that, as far as the pre-Conquest charters are concerned, the Public Record Office manuscript is a copy of the Bodleian manuscript, and the British Library manuscript is a copy of the Public Record Office manuscript, although this does not preclude the possibility that the first cartularist's exemplar was also available to the scribes of the later manuscripts, nor that all three cartularists made some use of the Gesta Pontificum.

Of the 30 Anglo-Saxon charters in the cartularies, 20 are transcribed in the Gesta Pontificum. The other 10 seem to have been omitted because their content was included in other documents and they would have added nothing to William of Malmesbury's narrative. Only two charters in the Gesta Pontificum are not in the cartularies. One, which purports to be a seventh-century grant by the Mercian comes, Coenfrith (S1166), may have been disregarded by the first cartularist because it was not a royal charter and related to an estate for which there were royal charters (S256, 435). The other (S436) is a conflation of three charters which are in the cartularies but not in the Gesta Pontificum (S415, 434, 435; ECW, no. 244), so that the same substance is included in all four manuscripts. William of Malmesbury never includes witness lists in his transcriptions, but gives a brief note of the names of some witnesses in his narrative. Sometimes such a note relates to two or three charters of much the same date. Comparison with the cartulary texts shows that William's details of witnesses are incomplete, and that where one list relates to more than one charter, it is a conflation of the relevant witness lists, and does not provide accurate information about any single document. The transcripts in the Gesta Pontificum are slightly abbreviated by the omission of odd words or phrases and sometimes a whole clause. In only one instance is a substantial portion of a text omitted, and this seems to have been because the document

was a later insertion and the space left for it proved to be inadequate (S256).

In many charters there are minor discrepancies between William's text and that in the cartularies: one word is substituted for another of much the same meaning; the order of words is altered; or the grammar differs slightly, for example in the tense of a verb. It is difficult to demonstrate the origin of these discrepancies, but perhaps the most likely explanation for them is that William of Malmesbury habitually introduced minor amendments in the course of copying in order to improve his exemplars. These amendments never affect the sense of the document significantly. The source material used by William for the Anglo-Saxon charters, presumably a collection of single sheets or an early cartulary not now extant (or both) was probably also the exemplar used by the thirteenth-century cartularist.

All quotations from charters in the discussions below are taken from Bodleian, Wood empt 5, which seems to provide the best as well as the earliest full text of the charters. The only exceptions to this involve two documents extant only in other manuscripts. An Old English version of a privilege of pope Sergius I to Aldhelm (B106) survives in a copy of the West Saxon translation of the gospels, British Library, Cotton Otho C i, where it was written in two originally blank leaves in the eleventh century. And a grant of Æthilbald of Mercia to an abbot named Eanberht (S96) survives on a single sheet of unknown provenance, now Cotton Charter VIII 3 in the British Library. These manuscripts are further discussed in connection with the relevant documents below. The charter of Æthilbald is included here since there is reason to believe that the beneficiary was abbot of Malmesbury.

With only a single exception, all the Anglo-Saxon charters surviving in the Malmesbury archive relate directly to Malmesbury, most of them

being royal grants of land to the monastery or its personnel. The one exception is a grant of Æthelred II to the layman Wenoth (S862). It is reasonable to assume that the Malmesbury archive did at one time include grants to laymen such as survive among other monastic records, and it appears that the cartularists did not consider it appropriate to include such documents in the cartularies. It is possible that some surviving charters expressed as grants to Malmesbury were originally grants to laymen and have been altered, and this possibility has to be borne in mind in considering individual documents. But the small number of pre-Conquest charters preserved at Malmesbury compared with those surviving on other archives such as Glastonbury, Abingdon or Winchester strongly suggests that the extant material represents a selection of documents preserved because they related to Malmesbury, not an entire collection of charters altered to make them relate to Malmesbury.

* * * * *

(b) The Abbatial List

A little-known text which has some relevance to one early charter, Æthilbald's grant to abbot Eanberht, is a list of the abbots of Malmesbury from the seventh century to the thirteenth. This survives in a thirteenth-century manuscript of miscellaneous matter, British Library, Cotton Vitellius A x. It was edited and discussed by Birch in 1871, but David Knowles and his colleagues were not aware of it when they compiled their book on tenth to thirteenth-century heads of religious houses (Knowles et al 1972). The text is set out below from the manuscript.

B.L., Cotton Vitellius A x fo. 160r

S(an)c(tu)s Aldhelm(us) . Daniel . Megildulfus . Forþere^(a) .
 Æambriht . Sigibriht . Oþþelard^(b) . Wlfredus . Æþelmod(us) . Heþered(us)
 Ælþric(us)^(c) . Æþelþerd(us) . Cyneþerd(us) . Brihelm(us) .
 Brihtuuold(us) . Cynebert . Æþeric(us) . Wulsin(us) . Ægelpard(us).
 Æþin(us) . Brihtuuold(us). Brihtric(us) . Turolð(us)^(d) . Warin(us) .
 Godefrid(us) . Ædulf(us) . Iohannes . Petrus . Gregori(us) . Rob(ertus) .
 Osb(er)t(us) . Nic(holaus) . Rob(ertus) . Walt(erius) . Iohannes .

(a) recte Forþere

(b) recte Oþþelard

(c) recte Ælþric(us)

(d) the second and third letters are doubtful.

From Ælfric, who was abbot in the second half of the tenth century, onwards, the list appears to be virtually complete and accurate (Knowles et al. 1972, pp. 54-56), but for the early period it is very deficient. Of the ten names preceding Ælfric, only one, Aldhelm, is quite definitely that of an abbot of Malmesbury. A second 'Æambriht', is probably that of an eighth-century abbot of the house and to be identified with the beneficiary of Æthilbald's grant; this is one of the reasons for believing this charter to be a grant to Malmesbury. It is virtually certain that one name in the list, Daniel, is that of a man who was never abbot of the house. The bishop of Winchester (705-c.746) is the only recorded bearer of this name in early Wessex (there was a tenth-century bishop of Cornwall named Daniel, but he can scarcely be the person meant here), and he was consecrated to the see at the same time as Aldhelm became bishop of Sherborne. The compiler of the abbatial list probably found the name in a list of churchmen commemorated at Malmesbury in a Liber Vitae or necrology. William of Malmesbury's statement that Daniel, on his retirement, became a monk at Malmesbury (GP, p. 160) probably

also derives from a commemorative record. If Daniel had entered into an agreement of confraternity with Malmesbury, as is quite likely, he could well have been recorded as a member of the community, and this could have misled both William and the compiler of the abbatial list. Similarly the Forthere named in the list is probably Aldhelm's successor as bishop of Sherborne, Æthilmod may well be the late eighth-century holder of the same see, and Heathored is probably the bishop of Worcester contemporary with Æthilmod. 'Megildulfus' seems to be a version of the Irish name, Maildub, from which the place-name Malmesbury is apparently ultimately derived (HE V 9; Tangl, no. 135; PN Wiltshire, pp. 47-8). Perhaps Maildub, who may have lived a religious life, with or without companions, on the site before the Saxon monastery was founded, was also commemorated at Malmesbury. It is noticeable that the author of the abbatial list was not acquainted with the theory that this man was the founder of Malmesbury (GP, pp. 333-4); he places 'Megildulfus' third in the list and considers Aldhelm to have been the first abbot. Æthilheard might be the eighth-century bishop of Winchester or the man who was archbishop of Canterbury from 792 to 805, and Wulfred could well be Æthilheard's successor at Canterbury. Sigiberht is unidentified, and may have been an otherwise unrecorded abbot of Malmesbury. Two men known to have been early abbots of Malmesbury are not in the list: Eaba, mentioned in a letter to Lul (Tangl, no. 135), was apparently abbot in the early eighth century, possibly Aldhelm's immediate successor; Cuthberht is the beneficiary named in a grant to Malmesbury of 796 (S149) and also appears in a witness list of 803 (B312).

The inaccuracy and inadequacy of the early part of the abbatial list suggests that the work is a compilation produced probably in the tenth century, certainly not earlier, and continued thereafter. The author appears to have had very little information about the early

abbots of the house, and he probably drew up the early part of the list in much the same way as the compiler of the very similar Glastonbury abbatial list appears to have done, by taking names from commemorative records and possibly also making use of other written records (although not, apparently, of charters) and of oral traditions. The first section of the list cannot be considered as a reliable source for the early abbots of Malmesbury, but it is a list of names which were available to a man working at Malmesbury probably in the tenth century, and were thought by him to be those of early abbots. In some cases he may have been right.

Another abbatial list for Malmesbury survives in a transcript by Thomas Hearne, now Bodleian Rawlinson B414, of a manuscript which was apparently destroyed by fire in 1737. The transcript was edited by Stubbs (Stubbs 1883, pp. cxviii-cxix). The author of this list evidently worked from the Gesta Pontificum: he not only duplicates William of Malmesbury's information, but often transcribes clauses word for word. He also appears to have made use of an earlier copy of the Cottonian list. He incorporates six names, from Daniel to Æthilheard, which are not derived from the Gesta Pontificum and which correspond to a section of the Cottonian list, and he adds several further names after that of William of Malmesbury's contemporary, abbot Godfrey, down to Nicholas, during whose abbacy, 1183-1187, this list was presumably compiled. These additional names again match the relevant section of the Cottonian list, but that has a further three names and was apparently continued after the Rawlinson compiler used it. The Rawlinson list is therefore merely a conflation of two extant sources, and adds no information about the early abbots of Malmesbury.

(c) The Charters

The surviving Malmesbury charters relating to the period down to 839 are listed below. For those not included by Sawyer, Birch's numbers are given in brackets.

<u>S</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Donor</u>	<u>Beneficiary</u>
1245	675	Leuthere, bishop	Aldhelm, priest
1166	680	Coenfrith, <u>comes</u>	Aldhelm, abbot
71)) 73)	681	Æthilred, king	Aldhelm, abbot
1169	685	Berhtwald, sub-king	Aldhelm, abbot
1170	c676 x c686	Baldred	Aldhelm, abbot
231)) 234)	688	Ceadwalla, king	The church
(105/6)	687 x 701	Sergius, pope	Aldhelm, abbot
243	701	Ine, king	Aldhelm, abbot
245	704	Ine, king	West Saxon churches
(114)	705	Aldhelm, bishop	Malmesbury
256	745	Cuthred, king	Malmesbury
260	758	Cyniwulf, king	Malmesbury
149	796	Ecgfrith, king	Cuthberht, abbot
96	757	Æthilbald, king	Eanberht, abbot

S1245

Bodleian, Wood empt. 5, fos. 11v-13v.

(Edition: B37)

This charter purports to record a grant of the monastery at Malmesbury to Aldhelm, then a priest, by Leuthere, bishop of the West Saxons, in 675. The document survives in the three manuscripts of the cartulary and was transcribed by William of Malmesbury in both the Gesta Pontificum and the Gesta Regum. It appears to be a fabrication, but the author has appended to it a sanction, dating clause and witness list which may well derive from an authentic charter of the 670s.

The proem and dispositio are very long and elaborate, recalling Aldhelm's style of writing, and in fact Ehwald considered that this charter should be included among Aldhelm's works (Ehwald, p. 507). But A.S. Cook carried out a detailed examination of the proem, showed that virtually every word in it was used by Aldhelm and that many of its phrases are also paralleled in Aldhelm's works, and argued that the passage was drawn up some time after Aldhelm's death by someone who took words and phrases from Aldhelm's writings and carefully put them together in order to produce a piece of Aldhelmian prose (Cook 1929). Cook's arguments are accepted by Lapidge and Herren (p. 173). On diplomatic grounds the charter can similarly be shown to be a work of later date. The earliest Anglo-Saxon charters were usually very simple in content and phraseology, relying largely on formulas derived from the late Roman private deed, and were never written in the pretentious, literary style of this document.

Consideration of the content of the charter establishes with reasonable certainty that it is not an elaboration of a genuine document, but is basically a fabrication. It is asserted that Aldhelm had been a member of the Malmesbury community from childhood and received his

education there. Such details of a man's early life are never included in genuine charters dating from his lifetime, and this passage must have been written after Aldhelm's death and in the light of his fame as a writer and teacher. There is no parallel for the grant of an existing monastery to a priest in any extant early charter, and no reason to suppose that the succession of a new abbot ever involved a formal, written grant of property. Grants of land were certainly made when the beneficiaries were going to found new monasteries on the estates concerned (e.g. S235), but in this case it is made clear that an existing monastery is in question.

This charter, therefore, cannot be defended as an authentic, seventh-century instrument, nor even as having any basis in a genuine charter. But, nevertheless, it does appear that the author of this text did have before him a charter dating from the 670s, since the witness list appended to the text seems to derive from such a charter. The list is headed by Leuthere, who attests with his characteristic humility formula 'ac si indignus episcopus' (Cf. S51, 1164; Sims-Williams 1975, p. 5). Two abbots follow: Cyniberht, who is perhaps to be identified with the abbot of 'Hreutford' (now Redbridge near Southampton) mentioned by Bede as a contemporary of king Ceadwalla (HE IV 16); and Hæddi, presumably the man who succeeded Leuthere as bishop. The next witness is the priest Wynberht, who appears in several early charters and is likely to be the man who later became abbot of Nursling (S231, 239, 243, 1164, 1170, 1248; Levison, Boniface, p. 14). The other priest who attests here, Hiddi, is otherwise unknown, and the last witness who is named Headda and given no title cannot be securely identified but may be the layman who attests a charter of Ceadwalla of 688 (S235). The first four of these witnesses also attest the charter recording Coenred's grant of the early 670s to abbot Bectun, and appear there in the same order, with the same titles, and with similar, if not identical, subscription forms:-

S1245: '+Ego Leutherius ac si indignus episcopus rogatus a
fratribus hanc donationis cartam subscripsi .
+ Ego Cunibectus abbas subscripsi .
+ Ego Haeddi abbas subscripsi .
+ Ego Wimberctus presbiter : subscripsi .'

S1164: '+Ego Leotheriusquamuis indignus episcopus hanc
cartulam donacionis subscripsi . + Ego Cunibertus
abbas subscripsi . + Ego Hadde abbas subscripsi .
+ Ego Wimbertus presbiter qui hanc cartulam rogantes
supra effato abbate scripsi et subscripsi '.

These parallels are only explicable on the assumption that the author of the spurious charter of Leuthere copied these subscriptions from a genuine charter originally drawn up at much the same time as Coenred's. The dating clause could be taken from the same document; it reads:-

'Actum publice iuxta flumen Bladon . uii . kalendas
 Septembris . Anno incarnationis Cristi . Dc . lxx . u .'

Incarnational dating is most unlikely to have been used in an Anglo-Saxon charter as early as 675, and this form of the year may be a substitution for an indiction, or simply an addition to a clause originally containing no indication of the year. The rest of the wording could be genuine. The phrase 'Actum publice' occurs in two authentic early Malmesbury charters (S245, 1169), while the statements of the place and the exact day are quite usual. The sanction which immediately precedes this clause, 'Quod si quis hec scripta ...', is worded in a fairly straightforward way and is of a type common in early charters, so it too may be genuine. Patrick Wormald suggests that a longer passage beginning 'Sed ne forte contentionis ...' may be basically authentic (Wormald 1984, p. 29 n. 14).

There is no evidence for the content of the charter from which these clauses were taken, and no reason to assume that the content of the extant text reflects it. The author of the surviving document may have dropped the name of Coenred or some other obscure donor from the witness list he copied, preferring to use the name of the famous bishop Leuthere. Nor is there any certainty that the genuine charter was a

grant to Aldhelm or anyone at Malmesbury: it may have recorded a gift to some other house and have come into the possession of Malmesbury at a later date, just as Coenred's only extant charter (S1164) eventually came into the possession of Shaftesbury. Equally, there is no evidence to suggest that the charter is based on oral tradition at Malmesbury, itself originating in the recollection of actual patronage of Aldhelm by Leuthere. William of Malmesbury found no evidence for such patronage apart from this charter, and the identity of the bishop whom Aldhelm addressed in a letter as his earliest patron is uncertain (cf. Lapidge and Herren, p. 137). This document therefore provides no information about seventh-century Malmesbury.

The only property granted by this charter is the monastery of Malmesbury itself, and it does not therefore appear that the document was designed, as many fabricated charters were, to support a claim to an estate whose ownership was in question. Admittedly, ownership of the monastery itself was in question on more than one occasion: in 1055 Herman, bishop of Ramsbury tried to take possession of Malmesbury and establish his see there, but the community successfully defeated this attempt (GP, pp. 182-3; Knowles 1966, p. 131); they were unable to prevent Roger, bishop of Salisbury from annexing the monastery c. 1125 (GP, p. 176 + n.3; Knowles 1966, p. 275). But it seems unlikely that this document was forged in connection with any of these disputes: the text implies that Malmesbury was in the gift of the local bishop at a very early stage in its history, and this would scarcely have been helpful when the community was trying to resist later episcopal encroachment.

It seems more probable that the charter reflects an interest in the early history of the monastery, and particularly in Aldhelm, its most famous abbot, and that the assertion that Aldhelm had been a member of the Malmesbury community from a very early age was intended to enhance the status and reputation of the house by making it appear that Aldhelm

owed everything to Malmesbury, when the truth probably was that Malmesbury owed everything to Aldhelm. Since Aldhelm's reputation stood so high for so long, it is impossible to judge when the charter was drafted.

* * * * *

S1166

Bodleian, Magdalen College manuscript 172, fo. 82v.

(Edition: B54)

A charter in which a Mercian layman named Coenfrith is said to grant 10 hides at Wootton to abbot Aldhelm in 680 is known only from William of Malmesbury's transcription in the Gesta Pontificum. As suggested above, it may have been deliberately omitted from the cartularies because it is not a royal grant, and the monastery had other title-deeds for the estate. It is fairly clear that the document has no authentic basis.

The text begins with a long and complex proem in a style resembling that of Aldhelm which, like the similar proem discussed above, cannot be genuine in a seventh-century charter (Lapidge & Herren, p. 173). The same proem occurs in six charters in the name of Æthelstan dating from the 930s (S407, 415, 425, 426, 434, 435; also S436 which is a conflation of S415, 434, 435). One of these is a grant to the community at Malmesbury of 10 hides at Wootton (S435). The dispositio in Æthelstan's charter is much longer than that in the document in Coenfrith's name, but it includes almost every word in the latter. The dispositio of the charter of Coenfrith is set out below, those words which also occur in Æthelstan's Wootton charter being underlined:-

'Cuius amore felicitatis illectus . ego Cenfrithus comes
Mertiorum . quandam telluris particulam uenerabili abbati
Aldhelmo . sub estimatione . x(ā) cassatorum . in loco qui
dicatur Wdetun . ad seruiendum (ā) deo et sancto Petro in

perpetuum ius largitus sum . cum consensu domini mei
 Æthelredi regis'.

(a) servienti familiae, S435

Much of this wording also occurs in the other five charters of Æthelstan which share the proem. The extent of the duplication in the Coenfrith charter leaves little doubt that this was drawn up by a man who had Æthelstan's Wootton charter before him.

The only details which do not derive from Æthelstan's charter, that is the names and titles Coenfrith comes, Aldhelm abbas and Æthilred rex, have presumably been taken from the earliest extant authentic Malmesbury charter, which records a grant of land to abbot Aldhelm made by Æthilred, king of the Mercians (675-704) at the request of his patricius and propinquus Coenfrith, who attests with the title comes (S71/73). The dating clause also appears to have been taken from this text. Æthilred's charter survives in two versions, one dated 680, 9th indiction (which are inconsistent) and the other dated 681, 9th indiction (which agree). The charter in Coenfrith's name is dated 680, 8th indiction: probably the earlier incarnation date was chosen from the appropriate version of Æthilred's grant, and the indiction adjusted to fit it.

Only two phrases in the entire text appear to represent the compiler's own work, the title 'comes Mertiorum' (comes stands alone as a title in itself in Æthilred's charter) and the reference to royal consent, 'cum consensu domini mei'. Both are anachronistic. The titles given to seventh- and eighth-century rulers who were not strictly reges, such as subregulus, dux and princeps, were sometimes combined with the names of people or provinces, but in every case the man concerned, although he might acknowledge a ruler of a wider area as his king, was himself the ruler of the people specified. For example, the Middle Angles in the seventh century were within the Mercian empire of Penda, but they had their own ruler, Penda's son Peada, hence Bede refers to 'Middilengli

sub principe Peada' (HE V 24). Similarly, there is little doubt that Tondberht, the first husband of St. Æthilthryth, described as 'princeps uidelicet Australium Gyruiorum' was the ruler of the South Gyrwe, although probably acknowledging the authority of some more powerful king (HE III 21). 'Uhtredus deo donante regulus Huicciorum' and 'Aldred subregulus Huicciorum' were effectively kings of the Hwicce although their charters mention the consent of Offa, king of the Mercians (S58, 62), and in the same way Bruny and Oslac, both described as 'dux Suthsaxonum' were rulers of the South Saxons (S1173, 1184). Another example is the ruler of Surrey who was an early benefactor of Chertsey: 'Fritheuualdus provinciæ Surrianorum subregulus Regis Wlfarii Merciorum' (S1165). The title given to Coenfrith does not fit this pattern. It does not specify a people or province of which he was the ruler, but refers to the people of whom we know Æthilred was the king, Coenfrith merely occupying some subordinate position within that kingdom. The title is therefore meaningless. There is no parallel for it and it can scarcely be genuine.

Reference to the consent of a king is common in early charters whose donors are laymen or subordinate rulers, but the wording in this document is anachronistic in including the phrase 'domini mei', which never occurs in authentic early charters in clauses recording royal consent. The single instance of its occurrence in a text of early date is in a charter of Oshere of the Hwicce which is much interpolated, and in which this phrase is likely to be part of the spurious material (S52). The phrase was used in the tenth century, for example in a Malmesbury charter of 901: 'cum licencia domini mei Eadwardi gloriosissimi regis' (S1205).

William of Malmesbury quotes a list of witnesses applicable to three charters, the grant of Coenfrith, Æthilred's charter mentioned above, and another early Mercian grant by Æthilred's nephew, Berhtwald

(GP, p. 352, S1166, 71/73, 1169). The list consists of the witnesses of the cartulary versions of Æthilred's charter plus Berhtwald. It appears that if the Coenfrith charter ever had a witness list, it was borrowed from Æthilred's grant.

Coenfrith is not the sort of donor one would expect a fabricator to choose, but a possible explanation is that the author of this charter wished to date it as early as possible in Malmesbury's history, and therefore borrowed names from the Malmesbury charter bearing the earliest date (except for the fabrication in Leuthere's name which may have been forged later or considered unsuitable as a model for some reason). Why Coenfrith was made the donor rather than Æthilred is unclear; just possibly the intention was to make this charter different, not too obviously based on another.

The estate of 10 hides at 'Wdetun', a fairly common place-name of which the modern form is Wootton, is mentioned in four Malmesbury charters. In addition to the one in the name of Coenfrith and the charter of Æthelstan on which it seems to be based, there is a problematical charter in the name of Cuthred dated 745 (S256 discussed below); and the estate is also included in a pancarta in the name of Edward the Confessor (S1038) which is probably spurious as it stands but may be regarded as giving some account of the estates which Malmesbury owned or wished to claim when the document was drawn up in its extant form, probably some years later than its purported date, 1065. Only in the last is there any indication of the location of the estate: it is said to be 'sita intra silvam Bradon', and this makes it fairly clear that Wootton Bassett, about 10 miles east of Malmesbury, is meant. The cumulative evidence of the charters indicates that Malmesbury owned or at least claimed the estate, but it was held by laymen in 1066 and 1086 (DB Wiltshire, p. 28.1). There is no specific record

of a dispute, but it seems fairly clear that Malmesbury owned the land and lost it, or attempted to claim it and failed, and the probability is that the charter in the name of Coenfrith was fabricated in order to strengthen Malmesbury's claim by making it appear that the monastery had owned the estate from a very early date. This was presumably done some time between 931, the date of Æthelstan's charter, and 1086 when the Domesday survey established that the estate was in lay hands.

* * * * *

S71 and S73

Bodleian, Wood empt. 5, fos. 13v-15r.

(Editions: B59, 58)

These two documents do not appear to be two distinct charters, but rather two versions of one charter. The wording of S71 is almost exactly duplicated in S73, and the latter has several additional details. Both versions are included in the manuscripts of the cartulary, but William of Malmesbury transcribed only S73, presumably omitting the other text because it was merely a duplicate, adding nothing to the information of the fuller version. The shorter text (S71) records a grant of land made to abbot Aldhelm by Æthilred, king of the Mercians, at the instigation of his kinsman, Coenfrith, in 681. The charter appears to be authentic, and this version probably preserves the seventh-century wording substantially as it was originally drawn up, subject only to the possible addition by a later copyist of one or two details.

The proem closely resembles that in another seventh-century charter, bishop Hæddi's grant to abbot Hæmgils of Glastonbury (Sl249). Æthilred's title is the one normally used by Mercian kings, 'rex

Merciorum', and Coenfrith is described as the king's patricius and propinquus: neither title is common, but the first occurs in other seventh-century contexts, a letter of Aldhelm (Ehwald, p. 503) and a charter of Ine (S252), and apparently was not used by later writers (Stenton 1913 p. 12; Thacker 1981, p. 220), while the second is used in a witness list of Ceolred, Æthilred's son (S65), so their appearance here tends to suggest authenticity, as indeed does the whole reference to Coenfrith, since a forger would not have been likely to invent such a feature.

The grant is made not only for the relief of the donor's soul, but also 'pro oratione fratrum in Maldubesburg deo seruientium'. It may be that this phrase is a later interpolation, since the earliest charters of Wessex and Mercia, unlike those produced in the east, did not usually name the monastery to which the beneficiary belonged (See e.g. S96, 231, 238, 248, 1164, 1167, 1168, 1249). It is, of course, impossible to be certain about the practice of those who drew up the earliest Malmesbury charters, but the evidence of three early charters of the house which do not include the name of the monastery (S231, 1170, 96) renders it probable that the name was not originally included but has been introduced into some early texts at a later date in order to make it quite clear who was the beneficiary.

The sanction and blessing closely correspond with those in a grant of Ine to Glastonbury which is almost certainly authentic (S248), and there are similarities in the wordings of other early charters (S245, 1248, 65). Blessings are not common in the early charters of Wessex or Mercia, but it seems that in this case both clauses are probably genuine. The dating clause includes the word cyrographum, which occurs in the works of Aldhelm (Ehwald, pp. 62, 482, 489), and in other early charters (S235, 1248; Levison 1946,

p. 232 n. 4). The date is given as an incarnational year, 680, and also as the 9th indiction; these are inconsistent, the 9th indiction falling in 681, and it is probable that the year of grace has been miscopied or miscalculated. This form of dating is in any case most unlikely to have formed part of the seventh-century text, and has doubtless been added by a copyist at a time when it had become normal for this form of dating to be included in charters.

The witness list seems to be entirely authentic. It consists of Theodore, archbishop of Canterbury; Seaxwulf, bishop of the Mercians; Bosel, bishop of the Hwicce; king Æthilred; and Coenfrith. These men were all contemporaries and, as far as can be ascertained, fit the date 681. Theodore arrived in England c. 669 and was archbishop until his death c. 690. Seaxwulf's episcopate cannot be closely dated, but he was consecrated by Theodore, was active as bishop in 676-678, and appears in a number of charters with king Æthilred, including one which appears to date from the late 680s (HE IV 6; IV 12; S233; also S1803-6). Bosel attests another charter of 681 with Theodore and Æthilred, and held the see of Worcester until his retirement because of ill-health shortly after Theodore's death (S1167; HE IV 23). Æthilred was king in Mercia from 675 to 704 (HE V 24). Coenfrith is unknown outside the two versions of this charter and the spurious document in his name discussed above, but his existence need not be doubted. His invention is not probable and other members of the Mercian royal family at this time bore C-alliterating names: Æthilred's sister, Cyniburh, his kinsman and immediate successor, Coenred, and his son, Ceolred (HE III 21; V 19). Theodore's attestation includes the formula 'gratia dei archiepiscopus' which occurs in most of the charters he attests (e.g. S7, 10, 13, 1167), and the name of Seaxwulf preserves the archaic spelling 'Saxulbus'. The

subscription forms distinguish lay from clerical witnesses: the author of this document, probably working in a scriptorium at Malmesbury itself, followed West Saxon practice in this respect.

The estate granted in this charter is described as 15 hides 'iuxta Tettan monasterium'. The town which grew out of Tetta's monastery is now Tetbury in Gloucestershire. The estate is not mentioned as a possession of Malmesbury in any later record, and was apparently lost to the monastery in the late eighth century, when it was seized by Offa (See further under S149 below). Malmesbury probably tried to regain Tetbury, and use may have been made of Æthilred's charter, but it does not seem at all likely that the charter was forged for this purpose, since its wording and content indicate that it is an authentic seventh-century instrument.

The entire wording of this charter (except for a single phrase, 'in tremendo examine', from the sanction) is duplicated in the other version of the document (S73) which also included three additional clauses. In addition to the estate at Tetbury, this text attributes to Æthilred the grant of a further 30 hides situated to the west of the highway, 'ab occidentali parte strate publice', and identified in the cartularist's rubric as 'Newentun', now Long Newton near Tetbury. Secondly, the grant is specified as being made to Aldhelm's successors as well as himself, valid in perpetuity and free from all earthly services, 'et successoribus eius in libertatem terrenarum seruitutum . perpetualiter'. And thirdly, there is a sentence referring to the confirmation of the contract by the donor's making the sign of the cross and by the consent of the witnesses, in order that no-one may infringe the grant after the king's death. The only other difference between the versions is that the incarnational year is here given correctly as 681.

It is difficult to believe that the clauses which are peculiar to this version and which are evidently designed to strengthen the authority of the charter and in particular to emphasise its continuing validity in later years after the deaths of the original parties to the contract, could have been part of the original wording, since it does not seem at all likely that the later copyist who produced the other version of the text would have chosen to omit precisely those clauses which ensured that the document was still a valid title-deed in his own day. It can be more plausibly assumed that the shorter version represents the original text copied out with little alteration, and that these clauses have been interpolated into the text at a later date.

If the other clauses peculiar to this version are later additions to the text, it seems likely that the estate at Long Newnton has also been added, and was not originally granted by king Æthilred. Malmesbury still owned the estate at the time of the Conquest (S1038; DB Wiltshire, p. 8.8), so it seems that there was no reason for this estate to be omitted from a copy of the charter: as in the case of the other extra clauses, it has probably been added to the text. The purpose of the interpolation may have been to convert a document which was valueless, since the monastery no longer owned the estate concerned, into a title-deed for land which was owned but for which the house, for some reason, had no documentation. This seems to have been done at a fairly early date, before the estate had acquired the name Newnton, which is first recorded in Domesday Book (PN Wiltshire, p. 63), but it is far from certain that Malmesbury acquired the land as early as the seventh century.

Æthilred's gift of Tetbury is the earliest genuine and dateable grant to Malmesbury. The charter establishes that the monastery existed and that Aldhelm was its abbot by 681, and that the community

maintained friendly relations with the Mercian royal house. It is not impossible that the monastery was originally a Mercian foundation. It was situated on the border between Wessex and Mercia, but the line of the border at the time cannot now be precisely defined, nor, in all probability, could it then. The estate on which the house was founded could have been the gift of either a Mercian or a West Saxon benefactor. Aldhelm was probably a West Saxon, but this is not certain, and, even if it were, it would not preclude the possibility that he secured patronage in Mercia, as Wilfrid did (Colgrave, Wilfrid, ch. XL, p. 80).

* * * * *

S1169

Bodleian, Wood empt. 5, fos. 10v-11v.

(Edition: B65)

This charter, which survives in the transcriptions of William of Malmesbury and of the cartularists, records a grant of land to Aldhelm made by a king named Berhtwald with the consent of Æthilred of Mercia in 685. The document appears to be authentic.

Eddius, in his Life of Wilfrid (ch. XL, p. 80), gives an account of Berhtwald: he was a prefectus in Mercia, and the son of a brother of king Æthilred; he welcomed the exiled Wilfrid in the early 680s, and gave him land on which Wilfrid founded a small monastery before he was expelled from Mercia on the instructions of Æthilred. It seems fairly certain that this man is to be identified with the donor of the Malmesbury charter: the dates fit, there is in each case a connection with Æthilred, both sources represent Berhtwald as a monastic benefactor, and the title 'regnante domino rex' in the charter

fits Eddius' information that Berhtwald was a member of the Mercian royal family. According to William of Malmesbury (GP, p. 351) he was nephew of Æthilred, 'ex fratre Wlferio', but this is probably just William's own deduction from Eddius' information: it could well be right, but Æthilred had at least one other brother, Peada (HE III 21).

The text begins with a proem asserting the need for written records because of uncertainty about the future; proems expressing much the same idea in terms not unlike these occur in a number of authentic early charters of Essex and Wēssex (S65, 244, 248, 1164, 1248, 1784, 1787, etc.). Berhtwald's title also had parallels (S231, 245, 248; cf. also S235, 243). A sentence providing that the land is to be free of all secular services and mentioning the name of the monastery has probably been interpolated at some later date when the charter was being copied out: as noticed above, the monastery was not usually named in early West Saxon or Mercian charters; immunities were not introduced until the late eighth century in Wessex following a slightly earlier introduction in Mercia; and this sentence resembles the clauses which are found only in one of the extant versions of Æthilred's charter, and which, as discussed above, are probably spurious. The consent and confirmation of Æthilred are specified; it is quite usual for royal consent to be mentioned in a charter whose donor is a layman or subordinate ruler (Eg. S236, 1165, 1167, 1168, 1170), and the title here given to Æthilred, 'precellentissimum monarchum', resembles titles applied to him elsewhere, (S10, 12, 233; Colgrave, Wilfrid, ch. XLIII, p. 88; ch. LIV, p. 116), and apparently derives from similar phrases used in late Roman acta (Hartmann, Gregory, p. 376; Schiaparelli, Cod. Dip. Longobardo, nos. 7, 16, 18, etc.). The sanction is of a common type and there is no blessing.

The dating clause records that the grant was made at a synod held 'iuxta uadum Berhgford'; there is no other evidence for this synod and the place cannot be identified with certainty, although it may be the 'Beorhford' where Cuthred of Wessex fought Æthilbald of Mercia in 752 (ASC sa 752), itself unidentified. Either or both of these sites may possibly be Burford in Oxfordshire. The charter is dated the 30th July, the 13th indiction, and the cartularies give the erroneous incarnational year 635, which is presumably a scribal error, 1 having been dropped from De . lxxxu: the indiction fits 685. The year of grace is in any case likely to be a later addition. No witness list is preserved in the cartulary copies. William of Malmesbury provides a list of six men who he says are the witnesses of the charters of Æthilred, Coenfrith and Berhtwald (GP, p. 352; 573, 1166, 1169). This consists of the five witnesses of Æthilred's charter plus Berhtwald, and it seems likely that William compiled it by taking the witness list of the first charter, which included the donor of the second, and adding to it the donor of the third. There is no reason to suppose that in the case of Berhtwald's charter his exemplar included a witness list.

The land granted to Aldhelm is described as 40 hides on the eastern bank of the river 'Temis', i.e. the Thames, near the ford named 'Sumerford'. This has been identified as Somerford Keynes, Gloucestershire (ECW, no. 184; Stenton 1971, p. 69; S1169). An early doorway survives in the church there, and Stenton suggested that this might originally have been part of a church built by Aldhelm on his new estate (Stenton 1971, p. 151); the Taylors, who date the doorway to 650 x 800, confirm that nothing in its general form or detail is inconsistent with this theory (Taylor 1965-78, p. 556). The description of the location of the estate by reference to an

adjacent river is typical of early West Saxon charters. Somerford Keynes is not mentioned in any other pre-Conquest charter, and apparently passed out of the possession of Malmesbury some time before the Conquest. It was held by a layman in 1066 and by the bishop of Lisieux in 1086 (DB Wiltshire, p. 6.2).

The charter shows Malmesbury maintaining its friendly relations with king Æthilred and the Mercian royal house, receiving patronage, and acquiring lands which apparently lay in Mercia. The information of this charter and of Eddius establishes that Berhtwald was a ruler and landowner of some wealth and power, but subordinate to the king, his uncle. Like other minor rulers, he was sometimes, but not always called a king (Campbell 1979).

* * * * *

S1170

Bodleian, Wood empt 5, fos. 15v-16v.

(Edition: B71)

This charter, which survives in the manuscripts of the cartulary and in the *Gesta Pontificum*, records an exchange of lands between Aldhelm and Baldred, and appears to be authentic. The transaction is dated to the period c.676-c.686 by a reference to the consent and confirmation of king Centwine, and it seems fairly certain that Baldred, here given no title except in the cartularist's rubric where he appears as 'Baldred Rex', is to be identified with the man who granted land to abbot Hæmgils of Glastonbury in 681 (S236). It will be argued below that the dating clause, which dates the document to 688, and the witness list, which includes Centwine's successor, Ceadwalla, represent later confirmation of a transaction originally

concluded during Centwine's reign.

There is nothing unusual or suspicious in the wording or content of the document. It begins with a common invocation and there follows a proem which occurs in other early charters including that of Æthilred of Mercia discussed above. The estates are defined by reference to adjacent natural features, in this case woods and a river, as is usual in early West Saxon charters, and the contract involved an equal exchange whereby Malmesbury alienated as much land as it acquired, an arrangement which a later interpolator or fabricator would scarcely have invented. The beneficiary is Aldhelm, and his monastery is not named. Royal confirmation is a normal feature of early charters in the names of laymen or subordinate rulers, as noticed above in connection with Berhtwald's charter; Centwine, moreover, is mentioned in the text of the other extant charter of Baldred. The further reference to the consent of 'omnium principum ac senatorum eius' resembles a clause in a charter of Ine of 704: 'principes . et senatores . iudices et patricos subscribere fecimus' (S245). The sanction is of the most common type, and resembles some other early charters in stating that a transgressor will render account in the presence not only of Christ, 'eterni iudicis', but also of his angels (S71, 245, 248, 1248).

The land given by Aldhelm to Baldred consisted of 100 hides east of Braydon Wood. That which Baldred handed over to Malmesbury is described as 100 hides adjacent to the river Avon ('Abon'), around the wood named 'Stelcanleag', and at 'Cnebbanburg'. This was probably a single tract of land, not three distinct areas. The name 'Stelcanleag' survives in the hamlet of Startley a few miles south of Malmesbury and about a mile from the Avon, while 'Cnebbanburg' is tentatively identified with Nable's Farm about 1½ miles away (PN Wiltshire, pp.

73-4; Ekwall cited in S1170). These place-names do not occur in any other charter, and the estate cannot be equated with any Domesday manor, so that it is impossible to be certain whether Malmesbury owned it in later years. This land was much nearer to Malmesbury than the estate east of Braydon wood, and it is possible that the exchange was made as part of a policy of consolidating the community's landholdings near to the monastery.

Appended to the charter are a dating clause and witness list which date, not from the reign of Centwine, the king whose consent is mentioned in the text, but from that of his successor, Ceadwalla. The date given is August in the 1st indiction, 688. The witness list substantially corresponds with that appended to a charter of Ceadwalla granting to Malmesbury an estate at Kemble, Gloucestershire (S231). The four men who attest the grant of Kemble, that is bishop Hæddi, king Ceadwalla, the layman Cisi and abbot Wynberht, also appear here in the same order and with the same subscription forms, except for the substitution in Hæddi's attestation of 'confirmauī' for 'consensi'. In Baldred's charter there are two further names, interspersed with these, that of Baldred himself and Wudda, whose attestation form suggests that he is a clergyman, but who is perhaps to be identified with the layman who witnessed Ceadwalla's Farnham charter, of which Cisi was one of the beneficiaries, in the same year (S235). The creation of a spurious witness list for one or other of these charters by reference to the other is not impossible. But it may well be that in fact they were drawn up on the same occasion. Both are dated August 688, and the name of Wudda may have been omitted, either accidentally or in order to abbreviate, by a copyist of the Kemble grant, while Baldred may have been similarly omitted, or conversely interpolated into the other list by a copyist who felt that the name of the donor should appear.

It is probable that the dating clause and witness list of 688

were added to this charter as evidence of Ceadwalla's confirmation of the transaction. Such later confirmations are not uncommon, (S34, 65, 88, 238, 1184), and in this case there survives a brief account of the negotiations giving rise to it. William of Malmesbury transcribed a letter which Aldhelm wrote to Wynberht, doubtless to be identified with the abbot of Nursling and the witness of this charter, to request his assistance in recovering an estate (Letter XIII: Ehwald, pp. 502-3; Lapidge and Herren, p. 70). The authenticity of this letter has been questioned (Ehwald, p. 502), but in fact there seems no good reason to doubt that it is genuine, not least because there is no motive for forgery. The letter is fairly cryptic, being little more than a note of introduction carried by the messenger who will give Wynberht a full account of Aldhelm's business, but it does contain a brief statement of the case. Aldhelm's community purchased from the patricius Baldred at an agreed price an area of land which is described as suitable for the catching of fish. But the king has granted this estate, apparently to someone else without reference to the community's claim, and Aldhelm therefore asks Wynberht to intervene and enable the community to recover and retain the estate. There is no indication of date in the letter. Aldhelm's use of the humility formula 'servus servorum dei' has been taken to indicate that he was a bishop at the time of writing (Lapidge and Herren, p. 169), but it seems likely that this wording was not exclusively episcopal in the seventh century (see further under S245 below), and other considerations suggest that this letter dates from Ceadwalla's reign, and relates to the transaction recorded in the charter of Baldred.

It is a reasonable assumption that the Baldred of the letter is to be identified with the Baldred of the charter. The land described as suitable for fishing could well be the estate adjacent to the Avon, and the involvement of Wynberht in both documents provides a further link. Moreover, the problem described in Aldhelm's letter suits the

circumstances of Ceadwalla's reign: he gained power in Wessex by conquest and was therefore in a position to make grants of land to his followers without reference to the claims of previous owners, and such grants would be expected by his companions and essential to secure their continued loyalty. However, the support of the church was also valuable, and it may have been on this account that Ceadwalla was persuaded to restore to Malmesbury the estate on the Avon. His confirmatory witness list, appended to the charter recording the original grant, provided that secure title to the estate which Aldhelm had hoped to gain by his letter.

In this charter we have fairly clear evidence that Malmesbury was in touch with the West Saxon as well as the Mercian ruling elite, and enjoyed an amicable relationship with each, before the time of Ceadwalla. Baldred was evidently a West Saxon nobleman, probably of royal blood, in the position of a ruler subordinate to Centwine. His status was probably comparable with that of Berhtwald of Mercia, and, like Berhtwald, he was given the title rex only some of the time. Ceadwalla's original seizure of land owned by Malmesbury should probably not be regarded as having any particular significance for Malmesbury's political allegiances or his own attitude: he probably neither knew nor cared who had formerly owned the estates he granted to his supporters. But the interests of Malmesbury were brought to his attention, and he became a benefactor of what now became, if it was not before, a West Saxon monastery.

* * * * *

S231 and S234

Bodleian, Wood empt. 5, fos. 15rv and 16v-17v.

(Editions: B63, 70)

These two texts, like the two texts of Æthilred's charter discussed above, appear to be two versions of a single charter rather than two

distinct documents, and, as in the other case, the cartularists transcribed both but William of Malmesbury preserved only the fuller version. The transaction recorded was a grant of land by king Ceadwalla to Malmesbury, and the charter appears to be basically authentic.

The shorter text (S231) has no suspicious features and, except for the introduction of an incarnational date, may well preserve the wording of Ceadwalla's charter substantially as it was drawn up in the seventh century. There is no invocation and the document begins with a proem which resembles that in Centwine's grant to abbot Hæmgils of Glastonbury (S237). Ceadwalla's title is the same one that was used in Berhtwald's charter, 'regnante domino rex'. The grant is said to be made simply to the church, with no reference to the particular monastery concerned or the abbot. This is unusual but likely to be authentic since a later interpolator or forger would not have drawn up a document in these terms. The sanction has a prohibitive clause as well as a penal clause; the former is a feature of some other early charters (S51, 235, 238, 240, 244).

The document is dated the first indiction, the month of August, 682. The incarnational year is incorrect, fitting neither the indiction nor the donor, and is likely to be a later addition. The indiction dates the charter to the last year of Ceadwalla's reign. The witnesses are the king himself, bishop Hæddi of Winchester, abbot Wynberht of Nursling, and the layman Cisi who was one of the beneficiaries of Ceadwalla's grant to Farnham in the same year (S235). All four men appear as witnesses in a grant of bishop Eorcenwald of London to the monastery at Barking (S1248). The list appears to be genuine, although there is reason to believe that it has been abbreviated, as is discussed above in connection with another Malmesbury charter in which these men appear (S1170).

The land granted by Ceadwalla consisted of 132 hides situated on either side of the wood named 'Kemele', now Kemble in Gloucestershire

(The manuscripts clearly read 'c . xxxii' and not 's(cilicet) xxxii' as printed by Kemble, K24, and Brewer, Malmesbury Cart., p. 283). This estate was included among the possessions of Malmesbury in Æthelwulf's decimation charter (S305) in the pancarta which is dated 1065 but probably dates from some years later (S1038) and in Domesday Book (DB Wiltshire, p. 8.7), but in 1066 it was assessed at only 30 hides, so it appears that the monastery retained only a portion of the land granted by Ceadwalla. The estate is unusually large, but it may well be that Ceadwalla acquired control of so much land by his military successes that he was able to grant very extensive areas to the church, and this may have been the most convenient way of disposing of border areas. Kemble is north of Malmesbury and of Tetbury and Somerford Keynes, the estates granted to Malmesbury by Mercian benefactors a few years before, and it was probably part of Mercia before the reign of Ceadwalla. The border appears to have been shifted to the north, so that Malmesbury was brought firmly within the West Saxon orbit.

The differences between this text and the longer version of the charter (S234) are more extensive than the discrepancies between the two versions of Æthilred's charter. The fuller version begins with an invocation which is not in the short text, and it has a much longer proem which appears to have three component parts, the proem of Ceadwalla's charter, a linking clause, and a further clause which looks like a complete proem in itself (cf. S71, 1249, etc.):—

1. 'Omnia que uidentur temporalia sunt : et que non uidentur : eterna sunt .
2. 'Et iterum librica seculi fragilitas ostenditur : cum per apostolum eundem dicitur :
3. 'Nichil intulimus in hunc mundum : uerum nec auferre quid possumus . Icciro terrenis et caducis eterna et mansura celestis infule corona comparanda est .'

The phrases 'pro anime mee remedio et indulgentia piacolorum meorum' and 'deuota mente' are added to the dispositio, and several details of its wording are different. Aldhelm is named as the beneficiary, but there is no reference to Malmesbury. The sanction, like the proem, has some appearance of being a conflation of two distinct clauses. After the opening words it has two parallel clauses linked by 'et', of which only the second occurs, with minor discrepancies, in the short version of the text:-

1. 'sciat se obstaculum ire dei incurrere .
2. 'et
3. 'in ultimo examine coram Cristo et angelis eius rationem reddere'.

The dating clause is more detailed and different in some respects. The indiction is the 13th, which fits 685, instead of the 1st; the year of grace is 688; and the phrase 'mense Augusto' is here elaborated, 'xiiii kalendarum Septembrium die . feliciter'. The witness list, in addition to bishop Hæddi and Ceadwalla, includes Ceadwalla's predecessor, Centwine.

The estate at Kemble is described as in the shorter text except that the hidage here is 140 and there is an additional clause defining the location of the land, 'de orientali plaga termini stratarum usque famosum amnem qui dicitur Temis', the street evidently being the Fosse Way. Two further estates are added, 30 hides east of the wood called 'Bradon', and 5 where the rivers 'Abon' and Wilig' join, the latter 'maxime ad piscationem fratrum'. Later writers identified the first of these with Malmesbury's estate of 35 hides at Purton, also described as east of Braydon wood (S1038; GP, p. 388; see further under S149 below), and this may be correct. Also, the estate could have been part of the 100 hides east of Braydon wood which had been alienated by Malmesbury

during the reign of Centwine (S1170). The estate at the confluence of the Salisbury Avon and the Wylie is not otherwise recorded. The rivers meet at Salisbury, and there is no other evidence to suggest that Malmesbury held land there at any time.

In this case a number of considerations suggest that those clauses which are peculiar to the fuller version cannot be dismissed as simply the elaborations of a later writer. In the first place, several of them make no significant difference to the content of the document, and there is no apparent motive for their invention. These include the invocation, the extensions to the proem and sanction, and the subscription of Centwine. Secondly, some of the clauses reflect usages of the seventh and eighth centuries, which a writer of later date could scarcely have produced. The most striking instance of this is the addition of the word 'feliciter' to the dating clause: this was a practice deriving from the late Roman private deed which occurs in England only in a few West Saxon charters of the seventh and early eighth centuries, and was apparently discontinued after about 705 (See S236). Another example is the citing of Aldhelm as beneficiary with no mention of Malmesbury: a later writer, accustomed to seeing the name of the monastery in any grant to it would not have been likely to omit this detail. The descriptions of the two extra estates are also typical of early writing in their omission of place-names and definition of the lands by means of woods and rivers, and, if the first estate is correctly identified as Purton, it is particularly striking that this name is not used and that the hidage is different from that in later records. Thirdly, no clause in this text is identifiably anachronistic or typical of the usage of a later period.

It therefore seems likely that many, if not all, of the additional clauses in this version of the text originated in an early charter.

But that charter may not have been Ceadwalla's grant of Kemble, since two details suggest otherwise. One is the inclusion of Centwine's name in the witness list: Centwine, who abdicated and retired to a monastery on Ceadwalla's rise to power (Ehwald, pp. 14-15), could scarcely attest a charter of his successor. His name must derive from some other source. The other detail is the indiction, 13th here, 1st in the short version. Errors in Roman numerals are, of course, common, but one would not expect i to be miscopied as xiii. The latter perhaps originated in a separate source. These two details which do not fit Ceadwalla's grant do fit each other: the year indicated by the indiction, 685, lay within Centwine's reign. It may be very tentatively suggested as a possibility that this text has been produced by combining the wordings of two charters, Ceadwalla's grant of Kemble and a charter of Centwine granting the other two estates. This would account for the appearance of duplication in the proem and sanction noticed above. This is no more than one possibility. The evidence is too dubious and confused to admit of certainty.

* * * * *

Privilege of pope Sergius I

British Library, Cotton Otho Ci, fos. 68r-69r (Old English).

Bodleian, Wood empt. 5, fos. 57r-60r (Latin).

(Editions: B105, 106).

A bull of pope Sergius I addressed to Aldhelm as abbot of Malmesbury confers privileges on Malmesbury and on another monastery situated near the river Frome. The document survives in two versions, one in Old English, and one in Latin (n. 91). The first is extant only in a single manuscript, an eleventh-century copy of the West Saxon translation of the gospels, now Cotton Otho C i in the British Library, in which the papal privilege is written on two originally blank leaves in two hands

of the mid-eleventh century (Ker 1957, no. 181). The manuscript was badly damaged in the Cottonian fire of 1731, and there are several lacunae in the text of the privilege. (It has not been found possible to read all that Hamilton and Birch printed, but an examination of the manuscript under ultra-violet and other special lights has enabled some additions and corrections to be made to their text. I am grateful to the staff of the Students' Manuscript Room and of the Manuscript Conservation Department at the British Library, with whose help and co-operation this examination was carried out). The Latin version appears in the manuscript of William of Malmesbury's Gesta Pontificum and in the three Malmesbury cartularies. It is also written, in Joscelyn's hand, in the margin of the gospel book beside the Old English version, but Ker judges that Joscelyn took the text from the manuscript of the Gesta Pontificum. No surviving copy of the document includes the dating clause which, if it is genuine, it must originally have contained, so the bull can only be dated to the papacy of Sergius I, 687-701.

Early papal privileges surviving only in later copies present the same problem as early Anglo-Saxon charters not extant in their original form, that of determining whether they are authentic early instruments or later forgeries. The only scholars to have published an opinion of this particular document are David Knowles, who argued in general terms in favour of accepting many of the surviving documents purporting to be papal privileges of the seventh and eighth centuries, but described the bull of pope Sergius as less authentic in its extant form than many others (Knowles 1966, p. 576), and Lapidge and Herren, who refer to the document as 'almost certainly spurious' and also as 'patently spurious' (Lapidge and Herren, pp. 10, 204 n. 2).

In order to examine the text it is necessary to determine which of the surviving versions is the earlier. In most details of substance

they are identical. The Latin version does not include the attestations of Ine and Æthilred and the endorsement in Aldhelm's name which are appended to the Old English text, but it probably did include these originally since the Latin text in the manuscript of the Gesta Pontificum is followed by an erasure of half a page, and William of Malmesbury's narrative reveals knowledge of the endorsement (GP, pp. 370 n. 1 and p. 374 n. 1). But there is one detail in which the versions do differ. A sentence in the Old English text refers to 'þæt mynster . þæt is sancte Petre and sancte Paule gehalgud . on þam mæran gemynde gelogud æt Meldum . þæt is oþrum naman Maldumes buruh geclypud' (that monastery which is dedicated to St. Peter and St. Paul, in that glorious remembrance situated at Meldum, which is called by another name 'Maldumes burh'). The corresponding passage in the Latin reads 'monasterium beatorum Petri et Pauli apostolorum quod Meldum religiose memorie condidit . quod etiam nunc Meldumesburg uocatur' (the monastery of the blessed apostles Peter and Paul, which Meldum of religious memory founded, which is also now called 'Meldumes burh'). Since these two passages do not have the same meaning, one representing Meldum as a place, and the other as a person, it appears that one is a mistranslation of the other. The Latin is very simple and clear and could scarcely be misunderstood, but the Old English is rather more obscure, so it seems likely that the Old English is the earlier of the surviving versions and that the Latin is a translation of it, perhaps made by someone who was not fluent in Old English and required a Latin version for that reason. The translation may have been made by or on behalf of Faricius, an Italian monk who spent some time at Malmesbury at the end of the eleventh century before being appointed abbot of Abingdon. While at Malmesbury, he wrote a Life of Aldhelm in which he gives an account of the privilege of pope Sergius in terms rather similar to those found in the Latin text later transcribed

by William of Malmesbury and by the Malmesbury cartularists, and it appears likely that Faricius had this text before him (Faricius, p. 86).

In support of this theory it is possible to cite another instance in which a papal privilege is known to have survived after the Conquest only in an Old English translation, and to have been translated back into Latin: the bull of pope Leo III conferring ownership of the monastery of Glastonbury on the Mercian atheling, Cynehelm, is now extant only in William of Malmesbury's Latin text which William says is his own translation of an Old English exemplar (DA, p. 106). It is also noticeable that the story that Meldum was the founder of Malmesbury does not occur in any source earlier than Faricius and William, both of whom manifestly derived it from the Latin version of the privilege. The man who compiled the early part of Malmesbury's abbatial list, probably in the tenth century, listed Aldhelm as the first abbot of the house. This tends to confirm that the monastery did not possess any record of the alleged founder at an early date, and that the Latin text must be a late translation. The Latin is of some value because it is a version of the text produced before the manuscript of the Old English was damaged, but the Old English, presumably being a translation of the original Latin text, appears to be the earlier and more reliable version. The Old English translation itself probably does not date from earlier than the end of the ninth century, as a phrase in it, 'Angelsexena scire', is unlikely to have been used before that date.

The proem discusses the monastic way of life in a way distinctly flattering to monks, and finally declares that they are not only free from all secular obligations, but are worthy of the greatest honour. There is no parallel for this in any extant privilege or formula. The nearest to it are proems recorded in the Liber Diurnus which assert the need for security or stability in monastic life (Foerster, Liber

Diurnus, nos. 56, 86), and it seems likely that a proem of this type has been re-written by a later interpolator who wished to give the impression that the papacy sanctioned the claims which are made here for monks. The proem is unlikely to be genuine as it stands. The long and detailed passage of exhortation beginning 'We mynegiaþ eow geobroþru ...' which instructs monks how to live the regular life, is similarly without parallel and probably spurious. It may well be by the same hand as the proem.

The rest of the surviving text seems likely to be authentic in substance. The pope's title, 'papa godes ꝥeowa ꝥeow' translates the standard papal formula 'episcopus servus servorum dei'. The reference to the recipient's successors, 'and his æfterfyligendum', is closely paralleled in a privilege of a century later, 'et heredibus suis' (B337, a bull of pope Leo III addressed to Coenwulf of Mercia, defended in Levison 1946, p. 255; but cf. Chaplais 1968, p. 335), and may therefore be genuine, although it is also possible that it derives from the phrase 'in perpetuum' which was the usual termination of the opening protocol in an early papal bull (Poole 1915, p. 42), and which is not otherwise represented in the surviving text. Some words are lost from the next phrase, 'and ꝥur ... arwyrðum mynstre', but the Latin translation 'et per uos uenerabili uestro monasterio' is probably close to the original wording: the opening protocol of a formula for a papal privilege in the Liber Diurnus includes the phrase 'et per eum in eodem venerabili monasterio' (Foerster, Liber Diurnus, no. 86).

After the very dubious proem already mentioned, the document goes on to state that Aldhelm has requested the pope to strengthen the monasteries of St. Peter and St. Paul at Malmesbury and of St. John the Baptist by the river Frome with a papal privilege. There is no objection to this as a genuine narratio. The content is fairly usual, and there

are other instances of a single privilege for two monasteries, a surviving one for Bermondsey and Woking whose authenticity was convincingly argued by Stenton (B133; Stenton 1933, pp. 185-8), and one for Ripon and Hexham, not now extant but mentioned by Eddius in his Life of Wilfrid (Colgrave, Wilfrid, ch. LI, p. 106; Wormald 1976, pp. 147-8).

The dispositio is probably basically genuine since there are parallels for each of its provisions. It begins by stating that the monasteries are henceforth to be under the authority and protection of the apostolic see:-

'pæt hi under rihtum dome . and bewerunge þæs sylfan
þe we þeowiað ures aldres þæs eadigan Petres apostoles
and his haligan cyricean'.

Other privileges of the time place monasteries under the direct authority of the papacy, including those of pope Agatho for St. Augustine's (B38), and of pope Constantine for Bermondsey and Woking, and the same provision is included in one of the formulas of the Liber Diurnus (Foerster, Liber Diurnus, no. 86). Eddius implies that the privilege obtained by Wilfrid for his monasteries at Ripon and Hexham placed these houses under the jurisdiction of the papacy, since he quotes a document in which Wilfrid claimed that his accusers should go with him to Rome to obtain judgement 'sicut beati praedecessoris vestri Sergii papae scripta cernebant' (Colgrave, Wilfrid, ch. LI, p. 104).

The text then goes on to set limits to the rights of the diocesan bishop and other churchmen in the monasteries, and begins by stating that no episcopal see is to be founded there:-

'na hi huru þincga na gesetten nanne bisceop stol innon
hyra cyricean'.

It seems that this was also one of the provisions of pope Agatho's privilege for Ripon and Hexham, since Eddius asserts that the conversion of one of these monasteries into an episcopal see meant the loss of

the liberty granted by the pope (Colgrave, Wilfrid, ch. XLV, p. 92). The Malmesbury privilege then states that the bishop may not celebrate mass in the monasteries except by invitation of the abbot and community:-

oððe furþ on þær lætan þæne bisceop mæssan singan butan
gyf he þyder cymð gelaþud of þam abbude and þære geferræddenne'.

This provision occurs in papal formulas (Foerster, Liber Diurnus, nos. 32, 86) and in the privilege for St. Augustine's. When members of the community are to be ordained as priests and deacons, the bishop is to carry out the necessary ceremonies at the request of the community and without payment:-

'gyf hi neode habbað to halgigenne enigne mæsse preost
oþþe diacon for mæssena neode and þæt buton ælcum tweon halgie
buton ælcum scette'.

This is specified also in the privilege for Bermondsey and Woking. The community is to have the right of electing its own abbot, and is to hold an election without delay when an abbot dies, so that the regular life is not disrupted by lack of an abbot. Similar arrangements are made by other extant privileges (B38, 133) and freedom of abbatial election was among the provisions of the privilege granted to Benedict Bishop for Monkwearmouth and Jarrow, which is not now extant, but of which some account survives (Historia Abbatum, p. 375).

The sanction has all of the three component parts which may appear in the sanctions of papal documents, prohibitive clause, penal clause and blessing (Poole 1915, pp. 45-6). The dating clause and final protocol do not survive.

As already mentioned, the privilege is followed by the subscriptions of kings Æthilred of Mercia and Ine of Wessex, plus an endorsement in the name of Aldhelm. This addition is itself quite a usual feature of early papal documents: Eddius mentions that five kings confirmed the privilege obtained by Wilfrid for Ripon and Hexham (Colgrave, Wilfrid, ch. XLV, p. 92); Ecgrith consented to the terms of Monkwearmouth/

Jarrow's privilege (Historia Abbatum, p. 396); Coenwulf confirmed the privilege issued by pope Leo III for Cynehelm (Sl52). The persons named in the Malmesbury document were contemporaries, and it is understandable that this border monastery should have secured the confirmation of the kings of both Mercia and Wessex. Moreover, both kings are known to have had great respect for Rome. Eddius repeatedly refers to Æthilred's reverence for the apostolic see (Colgrave, Wilfrid, ch. XLIII, pp. 88-90; ch. XLV, p. 92; ch. LVII, p. 124), and Ine abdicated in 726 so that he might retire to Rome (HE V 7; ASC s.a. 726). Aldhelm's endorsement states that the kings agreed that whether there was peace or war between Saxons and Mercians, the monastery would always be in peace:-

'swa hweþer swa hit wære swa sibb swa twyrednys betweenan
Saxan and (Myr ...) þæt þæt (m ... r) beo (...) on
sibbe and þa þe (...)

This was certainly a very valuable agreement for Malmesbury if the parties observed it, and just what the monastery would need at that time. Moreover, it is difficult to imagine a forger producing such a clause, as it would be of no value in the days when Wessex and Mercia were united.

The general background to the document supports the theory of its basic authenticity. Not only are several monasteries of the time, in England and elsewhere, known to have obtained similar privileges, but such privileges were in some cases, and probably in all, secured by personal application at Rome. Benedict Biscop, for example, returned from one of his visits to Rome with a privilege for Monkwearmouth (Historia Abbatum, p. 369). Aldhelm is known to have visited Rome (Ehwald, p. 494), and it is likely that he would have taken the opportunity of requesting a privilege for his monastery. Both the general background and the internal evidence of the document therefore suggest that Aldhelm did in fact obtain a privilege for Malmesbury from pope Sergius I,

and it seems likely that the interpolation of two passages dealing with the monastic life is the only significant alteration which has been made to the text in the Old English translation which survives.

The privilege of pope Sergius establishes that Aldhelm ruled at least two monasteries, that he secured papal protection for them, and that he used his connections with the kings of Wessex and Mercia to neutralise the risks inherent in Malmesbury's border situation. He may well have been the founder of both houses: there is no evidence for the existence of the monastery at Malmesbury before Aldhelm became abbot there, and the monastery on the Frome is likely to have been a daughter-house of Malmesbury. As a scholar, writer and teacher, Aldhelm has been compared with his contemporary, Bede, but in his career as a public figure and monastic administrator he rather resembles Benedict Biscop. Much of what was achieved by both the eminent Northumbrians can be paralleled in the achievements of Aldhelm.

* * * * *

S243

Bodleian, Wood empt. 5, fos. 17v-18r.

(Edition: B103)

A brief charter in the name of king Ine grants four areas of land to Aldhelm. The text is written almost entirely in standard formulas and may well be wholly authentic, although the absence of a proem and sanction suggests the possibility of some abbreviation. The only unusual clause is 'cogitans uite eterne premium . uerens penas inferni perpetuas', which is placed in the dispositio, but tends to recall the content of proems, and is indeed followed by the word 'Iccirco'. It may be that the name of the monastery is a later interpolation, but the wording

'ad augmentum monasterii sui quod uocatur Mældumesburg' is similar to those in early grants to Eorcenwald's foundations of Chertsey and Barking: 'ad augendum monasterium ... quod nuncupatur Ciroteseige'; 'Ad augmentum monasterii tui quæ dicitur Beddanhaam' (S1165, 1171). It may therefore be genuine. The charter is dated 701, the 14th indiction; these are consistent and it is possible that both are authentic, or the incarnational year may be a later addition.

The witness list consists of only four attestations and has probably been abbreviated by a copyist at some time, but there is no objection to any of the names which remain. The king's subscription is followed by that of a layman named Oshelm who is otherwise unknown. It is possible that he was a kinsman of the atheling Oswald who made an unsuccessful attempt to secure the West Saxon kingship on Ine's abdication in 726 (ASC s.a. 726, 730). Two churchmen subscribe, Hæddi, bishop of Winchester and Wynberht, abbot of Nursling. The latter is said to have dictated the charter: 'Ego Winberhtus hanc donationem dictans subscripsi'. This subscription may be considered as one of the small group of scribal attestations involving Wynberht and others which occur in early West Saxon charters (Discussed under S236 above), and is likely to be genuine.

Ine grants a total of 45 hides of land:-

5 hides 'in loco qui dicitur Ihersdune';

20 hides 'ubi riuulus qui uocatur Corsaburna oritur';

10 hides 'in alio loco iuxta eundem riuulum';

10 hides ' iuxta laticem qui uocatur Reodburna'.

These descriptions have the appearance of authentic early eighth-century work. Estates which have acquired names of their own are not unknown in early West Saxon charters, but estates defined by naming adjacent natural features, often rivers or woods, are far more common. An account of four estates of which only one is given a name, the others being

defined by reference to nearby streams, is exactly what might be expected in a West Saxon charter of this date, and not what a later forger or interpolator would have written. Moreover, all these estates appear to have been altered in name, hidage or organisation in later years, so that it would have been pointless, and probably impossible, for a later writer to have drafted these descriptions.

'Ihersdune' is now Garsdon, about 2 miles east of Malmesbury. It does not recur in pre-Conquest charters and was not owned by the monastery in 1066 when it was assessed at 3 hides. This 3-hide estate, however, came into Malmesbury's possession by a grant of queen Matilda in 1091, and therefore appears in Domesday Book as the monastery's property in 1086 (Brewer, Malmesbury Cartulary, pp. 326-7; DB Wiltshire, p. 8.10).

The stream named 'Corsaburna' is now known as the Gauze Brook. It joins the Avon some 2 miles south of Malmesbury, but rises several miles to the west, just north of the hamlet of Littleton Drew. The 20-hide estate at the source of the Gauze Brook is not identifiable in any other record, and apparently did not survive as a unit. It appears to have passed out of Malmesbury's possession, since Glastonbury owned most of the land in this area in 1066; these 20 hides were probably incorporated into Glastonbury's manors of Littleton Drew (5 hides) and Grittleton (30 hides) (DB Wiltshire, pp. 5.6, 7.10).

The third estate, of 10 hides on the Gauze Brook, probably included the site of the modern village of Corston, whose name derives from that of the stream. Corston is one of the estates listed in Malmesbury's decimation charter of 854 and the pancarta dated 1065; it was owned by Malmesbury in 1066, but it was then assessed at 6 hides and considered to be part of the manor of Brokenborough (S305, 1038; DB Wiltshire, p. 8.6).

The remaining estate consisted of 10 hides on the stream 'Reodburna'. It happens that two streams in Wiltshire bore this name; both gave rise to the modern place-name Rodbourne; and both occur in Malmesbury records. This has caused some confusion in secondary sources. One 'Reodburna' follows a course very approximately parallel to that of the Gauze Brook, joining the Avon about $1\frac{1}{2}$ miles further south. The other is a tributary of the river Ray, formerly known as the Worf, by which name it appears in Anglo-Saxon boundary clauses, and is just north of Swindon; modern Rodbourne, sometimes called Rodbourne Cheney, is now a suburb of that town (PN Wiltshire, pp. 9, 32, 50-51). Rodbourne near Swindon is mentioned in the description of an estate given to Malmesbury by Cyniwulf, and occurs in Domesday Book as 'Redborne' (S260 discussed below; DB Wiltshire, p. 28.9).

The estate granted by Ine was probably on the 'Reodburna' south of Malmesbury, judging from its inclusion in a charter with other estates in the area. It probably included modern Rodbourne. This Rodbourne is included in the pancarta dated 1065, the identification being made certain by an account of the location of the estate and its grouping with other estates in the area; the amount of land is 10 hides, as in Ine's charter. Two other Malmesbury charters mention a 10-hide estate at Rodbourne, a very dubious pancarta in the name of Æthelwulf, and a grant of Æthelred II to the monastery (S322, 841). The hidage suggests that these relate to Rodbourne south of Malmesbury, but this cannot be considered certain in the absence of any other means of identification. This Rodbourne is not mentioned in Domesday Book and may have been included within Malmesbury's 50-hide manor of Brokenborough (with which it is grouped in the pancarta). There survives a set of bounds for the estate, but this is grouped with other bounds in a general cartulary and is not attached to a charter (S1587).

The wording and content of this document seem equally to indicate that it is a genuine charter of Ine.

* * * * *

S245

Bodleian, Wood empt. 5, fos. 18r-19v.

(Edition: B108)

A charter of king Ine dated 704 in which he grants freedom from all secular obligations to the churches and monasteries of his kingdom survives in the Gesta Pontificum and the three cartularies. Haddan and Stubbs in 1878 were the first scholars to publish an opinion of this charter. They excluded it from their collection of 'Councils and

Ecclesiastical Documents' on the grounds that 'it is not genuine and is not worth printing at length' (Haddan and Stubbs, p. 247). Chadwick, however, appears to have considered that this judgement should be qualified if not rejected altogether. Writing in 1905 he said 'This may be a spurious document but I can see no reason for refusing to believe that the signatures which it contains are those of Ine's council. If they have been invented the author must have been an expert philologist' (Chadwick 1905, p. 286 n.). Most scholars have accepted Haddan and Stubbs' opinion that the charter is spurious, but follow Chadwick in regarding the witness list as genuine. Stenton in 1913 referred to 'a genuine list of witnesses appended to a forged document' (Stenton 1913, p. 16). Stevenson in 1914 cited the text among charters which he classified as 'doubtful or spurious' (Stevenson 1914, p. 692 n. 16). Whitelock in 1951 described it as 'a questionable charter ... which nevertheless contains a genuine list of witnesses of 705-9' (Whitelock 1951, p. 27).

Two scholars, however, have suggested that the charter itself may be a genuine text of the early eighth century. In The Early Charters of Wessex Finberg awarded the document a single asterisk, which puts it into the category of charters available only in later copies whose authenticity is not in doubt (ECW, no. 368). And Brooks, in connection with his defense of the similar charter in which Wihtrred of Kent granted privileges to the churches and monasteries of his kingdom in 699, tentatively suggested that Ine's charter might be authentic in substance (Brooks 1971, p. 75 n. 1). A detailed examination of the text suggests that these views may well be correct and that the evidence does not support the condemnations of the past.

The authenticity of the witness list is really beyond any reasonable doubt. A forger might have taken names like Ine and Aldhelm from Bede

or from the Chronicle, but no forger could have drawn up the rest of the list, which includes several obscure but identifiable people. Abbot Hagona is known from a number of charter attestations (S45, 233, 235, 1171, 1248), although there is no evidence to tell us which monastery he governed. Eadberht is a common name, but this is probably the abbot, and later bishop, of Selsey, mentioned by Bede and appearing in other witness lists (HE V 18; S45, 235). Hæha was the abbot of a seventh-century foundation at Bradfield in Berkshire, some of whose records survive in a rather garbled form in the Abingdon archive (S239, 241, 252, 1179; Chadwick 1905, p. 285; Stenton 1913, pp. 16-17). Wintra was abbot of the monastery at Tisbury, mentioned as such in the Life of Boniface and in a charter of 759 which recounts the transactions giving rise to an earlier dispute (Levison, Boniface, p. 14; S1256). Abbot Wedr is otherwise unknown. 'Beornwald' is almost certainly an error for Beorhtwald, abbot of Glastonbury, known from the Life of Boniface and from a charter and a letter (Levison, Boniface, p. 14; S248; Tangl no. 7). Wilgar and Bealwulf are unknown. Froda was the abbot of Muchelney, appearing as beneficiary in charters of that house (S240, 1176), and Witta is probably to be identified with the abbot who attests two Evesham charters, both of which are very dubious texts, but which appear to have genuine witness lists appended to them (S54, 1175). Most of the laymen are unknown, but Coen may be the witness of a charter of Ceadwalla of 688 (S235) and Bealdhun is probably the man who granted land to abbot Froda of Muchelney in 708 (S1176).

The attestation forms are those characteristic of early West Saxon charters: all laymen attest in the form 'Signum manus X', and all churchmen in the form 'Ego X consentiens subscripsi', which represents a variation of the more usual 'consensi et subscripsi' except Aldhelm whose subscription is similar in substance. The orthography suggests

an early exemplar, in particular the name 'Æðilfrið', which preserves the early form of the element Æthil, spelt with an i and not with an e as was customary from the beginning of the ninth century (Napier and Stevenson, p. 38; Stevenson 1914, p. 702 n. 66; Sisam 1932, pp. 305, 325 n. 5). The witness list, therefore, has every appearance of authenticity.

Naturally this does not in itself confirm that the charter is genuine, because it is quite possible for an authentic witness list to be appended to a fabricated charter (As appears to have been done in the case of another Malmesbury charter, S1245 discussed above). This is, of course, the interpretation which has been placed on this document in the past, but there are reasons for thinking that the charter itself is genuine. In the first place, the witness list and the charter are both unusual, and they fit together in an entirely logical and consistent manner. The witness list is unusual in including so many abbots. In the majority of early witness lists there are no abbots at all, and when abbots do attest there are normally not more than two or three of them. The charter is unusual in being a general grant of privileges to all the churches and monasteries of Wessex, and not a grant to a single beneficiary. It seems reasonable that so many West Saxon abbots should have attended the meeting at which this grant was made, so that they could be informed of the new arrangements which were going to affect every monastery in the kingdom. If this witness list did not originally belong to this charter, it would be advisable to consider what kind of document it could have been attached to. It is difficult to imagine one more appropriate than the extant text. Fabrication of the charter can really only be argued on the basis that the forger recognised that the witness list was unusual and deliberately drew up an unusual charter to suit it, which does not seem very plausible.

The charter is dated 704 in a detailed dating clause which appears

to be authentic. 'Eburleagh' has been identified as Everleigh in Wiltshire which is otherwise unrecorded in pre-Conquest documents (PN Wiltshire, p. 329). The meeting was held on the 26th May, and it was probably not fortuitous that this was the feast-day of St. Augustine of Canterbury (ECW, no. 368). The indiction agrees with the incarnational year, and the addition of the word 'feliciter' is a practice derived from the late Roman private deed and confined in England to a small group of very early West Saxon charters (On this formula see above under S236). The whole dating clause seems genuine (subject to the possibility that the incarnational year has been added by a later copyist), but Brooks argued that the date was impossible since Aldhelm did not become bishop until 705 (Brooks 1971, p. 75 n. 1), and Whitelock, in assigning the witness list to 705 x 709, apparently took the same view (Whitelock 1951, p. 27). This view evidently was that the terms 'presul' and 'servus servorum dei', used of Aldhelm in this charter, could only be applied to a bishop.

It is fairly certain that 705 is the correct date for the death of bishop Hæddi and the consecration of Aldhelm to the new see of Sherborne, the single West Saxon diocese being divided at this time. This is the date given by Bede, whose West Saxon informants included bishop Daniel, who was consecrated to the see of Winchester at the same time, and Pecthelm, bishop of Candida Casa, who had been a member of Aldhelm's community for several years, and who told Bede of miracles which had occurred at Hæddi's tomb (HE V 18 and Preface). These men are not likely to have got that date wrong.

Lapidge and Herren argue (p. 10) that the true date of Hæddi's death and Aldhelm's consecration was 706 on the grounds that Bede states that the former occurred at the beginning of the reign of Osred of Northumbria, and that Osred actually became king in 706, not 705 as Bede suggests. But the fact remains that Bede dates Osred's accession

to 705 because either he or his source dealt with the two-month reign of Eadwulf (mentioned in Colgrave, Wilfrid, ch. LIX, p. 128) by means of that species of damnatio memoriae which Bede himself describes (HE III 1), so 705 is the date he intends to give for Hæddi's death. But in any case, the whole question of the Northumbrian dating is irrelevant, because it is highly improbable that the date of Hæddi's death was communicated to Bede as a Northumbrian regnal year. The Northumbrian and West Saxon dates were doubtless given to him or calculated by him independently, and appear together in his narrative only because they happened to coincide. Bede's information therefore is that Hæddi died in 705.

The compiler of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle entered Hæddi's death under the year 703 (ASC s.a. 703, corrected to 705 by the editor). The Chronicle also mentions the lengths of the episcopates of Hæddi and Daniel (ASC s.a. 703, 745), which suggest that the source was an episcopal list for Winchester. Episcopal lists, to judge from surviving examples, did not provide any dates (Page 1966), and the compiler of the Chronicle presumably calculated the incarnational dates which he cites. It is clear, however, that his calculations were erroneous. According to Bede, the abdication of Æthilred, king of the Mercians, and the succession of Coenred took place in 704, and the death of Hæddi and division of the West Saxon diocese occurred in the following year (HE V 24; V 18). The compiler of the Chronicle transcribed the entry relating to the Mercian kings from Bede's Chronological Summary, which thus formed the Chronicle's annal for 704, but he dated Hæddi's death to the preceding year, 703 (ASC s.a. 704, 703). A letter, extant in its original form, which bishop Wealdhere of London wrote to Berhtwald, archbishop of Canterbury, establishes that the actual order of events was in accordance with Bede's account, since it refers to Coenred as king in Mercia and makes it clear that at the time of writing there

was only a single bishop in Wessex (Wealdhere's letter is edited and discussed in Chaplais 1978, and translated in EHD, no. 164). The letter is undated and does not therefore confirm any absolute dating of these events, but it is consistent with Bede's account and tends to disprove the Chronicle's dating of Hæddi's death. The balance of probability is therefore that Aldhelm was consecrated as bishop in 705.

The charter, therefore, is dated to the period of Aldhelm's abbacy. Do the terms used of Aldhelm in the text contradict this? It is fairly clear that in later centuries the terms 'presul' and 'servus servorum dei' were used exclusively of bishops, but there is reason to think that this was not the case as early as 704. The word 'presul' is often applied to bishops in early sources, but is also used three times of Columba, who of course was an abbot and not a bishop, by his biographer, Adomnán, writing in the late seventh century (Anderson, Columba, pp. 180, 226, 540; on the date of the Life, p. 96), and Aldhelm uses the term of St. John the Baptist, of St. James, brother of St. John the Apostle, and even of God (Ehwald, p. 24 line 17; p. 23 line 9; p. 97 line 6). The word could apparently be used at this date of any man whose character or position made him responsible for religious leadership. It had not yet acquired the specific meaning 'bishop'. In this charter the word was probably used of Aldhelm simply because he was the senior churchman present, although it might also imply that by this time he was in effect the senior churchman in Wessex: Hæddi, who had been bishop since the mid 670s and was not present at this meeting, may have been ill or infirm and consequently retired from public business. It can similarly be argued that the humility formula 'servus servorum dei' was used at an early date by churchmen other than bishops. There is a well-known instance of its use by Gregory the Great when still a deacon (Hartmann, Gregory, p. 437), and Aldhelm

uses it in a letter (Ehwald, pp. 502-3) which can be dated by its connection with a charter (S1170 discussed above) to the reign of Ceadwalla.

Aldhelm, therefore, used the phrase while he was abbot of Malmesbury.

Another detail confirms that the charter is correctly dated to Aldhelm's abbacy. The grant is made to all churchmen 'qui in parrochia Saxonum conuersantur'. The usual meaning of the word 'parrochia' was 'diocese', and the reference here to a single diocese must imply that the document predates the division of the West Saxon diocese in 705 (I am indebted to Dr. Nicholas Brooks for drawing my attention to this point. Celtic-Latin writers used the term 'parrochia' in a different sense (Keynes, and Lapidge 1983, p. 262 n. 181), but there is no reason to doubt that 'diocese' is meant in this document).

Stenton, the only scholar to have put forward arguments in support of the theory that the charter is forged, said 'its formulas do not occur in undoubted texts of the eighth century (Stenton 1913, p. 16 n. 1). The validity of an argument expressed in these terms is doubtful because it implies that writers of early Anglo-Saxon charters could never deviate from certain fixed, standardised phrases, and there is no reason to suppose that this was the case. Moreover, nothing in the wording of this text appears anachronistic considered as a production of the early eighth century. The invocation is of a type common in early charters (Cf. S20, 45, 235, 1164); several other early texts have no proem (S8, 10, 12, 238); the king's title 'regnante domino rex' also occurs in the same or a similar form in other early charters (S231, 1169: 'regnante domino rex'; S235: 'dispensante domino rex Saxonum'; S1179: 'dispensante domino abbas'); and the sanction, with its reference to Christ and the nine orders of angels, is similar to a number of others (S71, 73; also S231, 248, 1170, 1248). The author appears to have had a much better knowledge of Latin than many

writers of early charters, whose grammar was not infrequently at fault, and who usually attempted no more than the plain expression of meaning without always succeeding in the attempt (Chaplais 1968, p. 317). This superior level of latinity is noticeable firstly in the vocabulary used. Some of the words chosen are less common substitutes for those usually found in charters, such as presul instead of abbas and sacerdos in place of presbiter. The writer had a much wider vocabulary than most charter scribes, as is shown by such words as parrochia, fiscalis, maiestas and fragilitas. There seems to be a deliberate policy of avoiding repetition by varying the vocabulary: monasterium and cenobium; preces and orationum offitia. The style of writing manages to retain all the simplicity characteristic of early charters but at the same time to achieve a degree of elegance wholly foreign to them. This is done by means of carefully balanced pairs of phrases: 'sacerdotum suggestionem et monachorum petitionem'; 'hanc libertatem ecclesiis impendo et hanc privilegii dignitatem monasterio confero'; 'sine impedimento secularium rerum et absque tributo fiscalium negotiorum'. It is noticeable that the style never degenerates into mere tautology. Many of the phrases are not strictly necessary, a much simpler wording might have served the purpose, and the reason for their inclusion seems to be stylistic rather than practical, but nevertheless every phrase has its own individual meaning which adds to the precision of the document.

The text is therefore rather different from the generality of early charters. But to assume on this basis that it is a late forgery would be a simplistic rather than a simple explanation. Not only are there objections to the theory of forgery on other grounds, but the writing really does not resemble later work. It was not until the tenth century that a high level of latinity became common among writers of charters, and it was then associated with a very complex and flowery

style of writing. There is no resemblance to such a style here. Nor does the charter bear any resemblance to the complicated texts produced by forgers endeavouring to imitate Aldhelm's Latin prose style (S1245). The affinity is rather with the very simple style of writing usual in charters of the period. The writer of this text improved on this style of writing but did not deviate from it. Consequently the wording is better than, rather than different from, that of other early charters, and seems consistent with the theory that it was produced by a writer of its reputed date.

This view is supported by the undoubted fact that many churchmen and women of this time were competent Latinists, as the surviving correspondence of Boniface, Lull, Daniel and others shows (Tangl). Moreover, nearly all the unusual words occurring in this text are known to have been used by writers of this period since they appear in the works of both Aldhelm and Bede (Ehwald, *Index Verborum*, pp. 555-738; Jones 1929). The balancing of pairs of phrases is also a feature of Aldhelm's prose style: examples from his works are 'paternam petitionem salubremque suggestionem'; 'in catacuminarum gradu et competentium statu'; 'pro me peccatorum pondere et criminum sarcina oppresso' (Ehwald, p. 294 line 1; p. 260 line 20; p. 478 line 7). It is not impossible that Aldhelm himself wrote this charter, but there were numerous other people who could have done so, including his pupils and colleagues at Malmesbury. Since there are contemporary parallels for the writer's level of latinity, his vocabulary and his style, the wording of the charter is in no way inconsistent with its date.

A version of the charter survives in the archive of Glastonbury (S246). This is discussed in the notes on Glastonbury above, where it is argued that the differences between the Malmesbury and Glastonbury versions of the text arise from alterations made to Glastonbury's copy

long after the date of the charter, and attention is drawn to evidence suggesting that the Glastonbury charter, now expressed as a grant to Glastonbury alone, was originally a grant to all the churches of Wessex, as in the Malmesbury version (Hearne, John of Glastonbury, pp. 370, 375). It is not entirely impossible that the charter originally survived in only one archive, and that contacts between Malmesbury and Glastonbury at a later date, perhaps in the time of Dunstan, resulted in a copy being made for the other house. But it seems more likely that copies of the charter were made at the time of the grant for all the churches and monasteries which benefited by it. The archives of Glastonbury and Malmesbury, being the two main collections of early West Saxon charters, are just where versions of such copies could be expected to survive. Moreover, there is clear evidence that copies were made for individual monasteries in the case of a charter of 838 which incorporated a provision applicable to a number of houses (S1438. Brooks 1984, p. 325). It is just possible that one discrepancy between the Glastonbury and Malmesbury versions of the charter arises from interpolation of the Malmesbury text. A sentence beginning 'Hoc uero decretum ...' which is not in the Glastonbury text, provides that the king's successors shall be bound by the terms of the contract. This is not the sort of detail one would expect a later copyist to omit, so it may be that this sentence was not part of the original charter wording. Reference to a king's successors is not without parallel (e.g. S19, 20, 21, 235), but the emphasis in this text is unusual, and the absence of this provision from the Glastonbury version seems suspicious.

Five years before the date of Ine's charter, Wihtred of Kent granted privileges to all the churches of his kingdom. The charter recording this grant survives in a number of manuscripts, including a ninth-century copy (S20), and Brooks has argued convincingly that the document is

genuine (Brooks 1971, p. 75 n. 1). The Kentish churches were granted freedom from all tax payments and also from loss or injury, 'ab omni exactione publicitributi atque dispendio uel lesione ... liberae sint'. This is similar to, but not identical with, Ine's grant, which provides for freedom from tax payments and from the burden of secular affairs, 'sine impedimento secularium rerum . et absque tributo fiscalium negotiorum'. Wihtrred's laws also provide that the church shall be free of taxation, and Ine's laws furnish some information about the taxes which were normally payable, including a detailed account of the food render due from ten hides of land (Wihtrred 1: Attenborough, Laws, p. 24; Ine 70.1: ibid., p. 58). The existence of the Kentish parallel establishes that Ine's charter cannot be considered anachronistic in content, and in fact the West Saxon grant may have been an indirect result of the Kentish one: West Saxon churchmen may have heard of the Kentish arrangements and requested similar privileges for themselves. Peace had been made between the two kingdoms in 694 (ASC s.a. 694); there were clearly contacts and exchanges of ideas, since one of the provisions of Wihtrred's laws is almost identical with one in the slightly earlier laws of Ine (Wihtrred 28: Attenborough, Laws, p. 30; Ine 20: ibid., p. 42; Whitelock, introduction to Wihtrred's laws, EHD, p. 396); and Aldhelm, by whose advice Ine's grant is said to have been made, had been a student at Canterbury (Letter II: Ehwald, p. 478; Lapidge and Herren, p. 153-4), and may well have maintained close contacts with churchmen there.

It may therefore be concluded that an examination of the text of the charter of 704 and consideration of other related evidence establish a strong probability that the document is an authentic charter of Ine, and that the version surviving in the cartulary of Malmesbury accurately reproduces the wording of the original charter, subject only to the possible interpolation of a single sentence.

In this charter, as in Wihtréd's grant to the Kentish churches, exemption from tax payments is clearly stated, but it is difficult to be certain of the meaning of the other half of the immunity in either case. It may be that Wihtréd's reference to freedom from loss or injury was intended to provide an assurance that no attempt would be made to attack monasteries or deprive them of their possessions. The purpose of Ine's statement that churchmen should be free from the burden of secular affairs, 'sine impedimento secularium rerum', may have been to grant freedom from secular services. A passage in Ine's laws refers to the possibility that services as well as payments might be requested in return for grants of land, but gives no details of the particular services which might be required (Ine 67: Attenborough, Laws, p. 58).

Ine's privilege, granted by Aldhelm's advice, suggests, in conjunction with other evidence, that Aldhelm was an important public figure in Wessex at this time. He was an exceptionally able man and was probably some years older than the king: he had been abbot of Malmesbury for over twenty years at the time of this grant (S71 dated 681), and had attended the court of at least one of Ine's predecessors (S235; also S237). During the following year he undertook the job of creating the new see and organising the new diocese of Sherborne, which must have been a far more demanding task than any which faced Daniel in succeeding to the established see at Winchester. The decision to split the diocese may well have been taken at the instigation of Aldhelm. The West Saxons' earlier rejection of the archbishop of Canterbury's order to divide the diocese, which resulted in their excommunication (Chaplais 1978, p. 22), was almost certainly due to the opposition of Hæddi who stood to lose by the proposed division, just as Wilfrid had opposed a similar plan in Northumbria (Colgrave, Wilfrid, ch. XXIV, pp. 48-50). The change of policy on Hæddi's death suggests that Ine had formerly been acting on the bishop's advice and was now influenced

by new counsellors, among whom Aldhelm is likely to have been prominent. His acceptance of the new see must indicate that he approved of the ^e_{nw} arrangements, and his status as a former pupil of the school at Canterbury, and the high opinion he had of that establishment (Letter V: Ehwald, pp. 492-3; Lapidge and Herren, p. 163), render it probable that he would have supported a proposal emanating from Canterbury.

* * * * *

Aldhelm's agreement to retain the abbacy

Bodleian, Wood empt. 5, fos. 19v-21v.

(Edition: B114)

This document, which purports to record Aldhelm's consent to a proposal that he should retain the abbacy of his monasteries after his consecration to the see of Sherborne, is described in the cartularist's rubric as a letter and was omitted by Sawyer from his handlist of Anglo-Saxon charters. But the document is drawn up in the form of a charter, consisting of proem, dispositio, sanction, date and witness list; and it survives in the three manuscripts of the Malmesbury cartulary and in the Gesta Pontificum with the other Malmesbury charters. So it appears that this text should be considered as part of the charter material relating to the early monastery of Malmesbury. Examination of the document, however, suggests that it is a fabrication drawn up much later than its ostensible date, 705.

The text states that Aldhelm, on his election as a bishop, proposed that the communities of the monasteries at Malmesbury, Frome and Bradford on Avon, which he had hitherto ruled as abbot, should elect a new abbot for themselves. But the monks resisted this plan, preferring that Aldhelm should remain officially abbot as long as he lived. They asked,

however, that they should be given the right of choosing their own abbot without outside interference after Aldhelm's death. Aldhelm made a formal grant of this right to the monks at a meeting in the monastery of Wimborne, where Cuthburh, sister of king Ine, ruled as abbess, and the king and bishop Daniel gave their consent. Not long afterwards at a synod on the river 'Noodr' the agreement of all abbots of Saxon race was secured. Following this account there is a fairly long sanction; a dating clause giving the year as 705, 3rd indiction; and a witness list consisting of bishop Daniel, king Ine, and the patricius Æthilfrith.

The content of this document is unlike that of genuine charters of the time. No genuine, early Anglo-Saxon charter consists of a grant of free abbatial election, although this right was sometimes included in early papal privileges such as that of pope Sergius to Malmesbury discussed above. It is scarcely believable that this transaction should have taken place at Wimborne, since Malmesbury is not known to have had any direct connection with that house, and there is no other record of such a meeting being held at a double monastery. Moreover, the gratuitous details of the abbess of Wimborne, which find no parallel in genuine charters, appear to have been borrowed from the Chronicle (ASC s.a. 718). The river 'Noodr' is identified as the Nadder in Wiltshire, now the Salisbury Avon (PN Wiltshire, p. 9), which is mentioned in the boundary clauses of a few pre-Conquest charters from the archives of Shaftesbury and Wilton (S326, 364, 438, 630, 631). But there is no other record of a synod on the Nadder, whereas the accounts of Eddius and Bede of the life of Wilfrid mention a synod on the Nidd in Northumbria at the beginning of the reign of Osred (Colgrave, Wilfrid, ch. LX, p. 128; HE V 19). By reference to the northern recension of the Chronicle, which dates the death of Aldfrith of Northumbria precisely to the 14th December 705, and to Eddius' Life of Wilfrid, which is the only extant

source to mention the two-month reign of Eadwulf which followed (ASC s.a. 705, D, E; Colgrave, Wilfrid, ch. LIX, p. 128), it can be established that Osred's reign began in 706, and hence that the synod on the Nidd almost certainly took place in that year. But a monk at Malmesbury is unlikely to have had access to a version of the Chronicle resembling the extant manuscripts D and E; his sources would have informed him only that Aldfrith died in 705 (ASC s.a. 705, A, B, C; HE V 18, 24), and, whether or not he knew of Eadwulf's brief reign, he would have assumed that Osred became king in 705, and hence that the synod on the Nidd occurred in that year. It seems likely that there never was a synod on the Nadder, and that this detail is based solely on the author's knowledge of the synod on the Nidd derived from Bede or from Eddius: since William of Malmesbury made use of the latter, it is probable that there was a copy at Malmesbury (GP, p. 210).

The witness list might have some authentic basis. The names of Daniel and Ine could easily have been lifted from Bede or the Chronicle, but the third name cannot be accounted for in this way. There was a layman named Æthilfrith active in the reign of Ine (S239, 245), and he is not mentioned in any narrative source, so if this name does not represent merely a lucky guess or the borrowing of a single obscure name from the long witness list of the general grant of privileges of 704, it must derive from an authentic record of Ine's reign which does not now survive.

There is no other indication of any genuine document lying behind the surviving text. None of the clauses resemble those of genuine texts in wording, and the content is basically unlike that of genuine charters, and appears to derive its details from narrative sources. The document appears to be a fabrication, although it is possible that a portion of a genuine witness list has been appended to it. Presumably the

purpose of the document was to claim the right of free abbatial election at Malmesbury without outside interference, and to give this right the support of Aldhelm's authority.

* * * * *

S256

Bodleian, Wood empt. 5, fos. 21v-23r.

(Edition: B170)

A rather unusual text in the form of a grant to Malmesbury by king Cuthred dated 745 is extant in the cartularies and in an abbreviated form in the Gesta Pontificum. A number of clauses from this charter are quoted above with similar clauses from Glastonbury charters of the mid-eighth century. These parallels of wording suggest that the Malmesbury charter has at least some basis in an authentic grant of Cuthred.

According to this document, the abbot of Malmesbury in 745 was named Aldhelm. One would be inclined to dismiss this man as the chronological error of a forger, were it not for the fact that his name occurs, with that of Cuthred, in another archive. They appear in a witness list appended to a spurious charter in the name of Ine in the Winchester cartulary. The names and titles from the Winchester witness list are set out below, together with those from the witness list of the Malmesbury charter plus abbot Aldhelm who does not attest but is named in the dispositio:-

<u>S242</u>	<u>S256</u>
Daniel, bishop	Daniel, bishop
Ine, king	
Æthilheard	Æthilheard
Forthere	
Puttock	
Cumma	Cumma
Tunberht, abbot	
Hagena	
Cuthred, king	Cuthred, king
Aldhelm, abbot	Aldhelm, abbot
	Ældhun

The appearance of abbot Aldhelm in the Winchester witness list can be interpreted in three ways. Either the name has been borrowed by a twelfth-century Winchester monk from William of Malmesbury's account of Cuthred's grant to Malmesbury in the Gesta Pontificum; or the name has been borrowed from an early record relating to the first Aldhelm; or the name derives from an authentic record of the 740s and therefore confirms that the abbot did exist. The first alternative does not seem at all likely for a number of reasons. Firstly the list is not entirely spurious. The names of Puttock, who attests a charter of king Æthilheard of 739 relating to Crediton (S255), and Tunberht, who was abbot of Glastonbury in 744 (S1410), would not have been known to a forger and must indicate that this witness list reproduces in whole or in part an authentic list of the 730s or 740s. A writer who had such a list available would not need to search narrative sources for names. Secondly a reader of the Gesta Pontificum would know that the Aldhelm of Cuthred's charter was not the famous Aldhelm, and would therefore have no particular reason to use his name. Thirdly, the lay witnesses Æthilheard, Cumma

and Ældhun are not mentioned in William's account of the Malmesbury charter, so the first two names, which occur in the Winchester list, could not be taken from the *Gesta Pontificum*, and it is reasonable to suppose that the name of Aldhelm derives from the same source as these other names.

It is also improbable that the first Aldhelm's name has been used. The list evidently derives from the 730s or 740s, except for the interpolation of Ine's name to suit the spurious charter, and the introduction of one odd name from before 705 would have been pointless. Moreover, if Aldhelm I was meant, one would expect him to appear in his better-known role as bishop.

The probability therefore is that the name of Aldhelm has been borrowed, with the other names in the Winchester list, from a charter of the mid-eighth century. It may be that the whole list derives from a charter of Cuthred, and has been altered only by the interpolation of Ine, some confusion in the order of names, and possibly some abbreviation. Or the Æthilheard of this list may be Cuthred's predecessor, the list having originated in a charter of his reign and the names of Cuthred and Aldhelm representing a later, confirmatory witness list, abbreviated by a copyist who chose to preserve the name of Aldhelm in the belief that this was the famous scholar. On this basis the Æthilheard of the Malmesbury text is a different man, but the name is too common for this to present any problem. There is no reason why Cumma should not appear in witness lists of consecutive reigns. The Winchester evidence therefore suggests not only that abbot Aldhelm II did exist, but also that the names in the Malmesbury witness list are authentic.

William of Malmesbury reports a tradition that the abbot was nephew to the first Aldhelm (GP, p. 387). This was doubtless someone's guess, made to account for the recurrence of the name, but it may well be

true that the two men were relatives, as the coincidence is otherwise scarcely believable. The only other possibility is that the later abbot chose to adopt the name of his illustrious predecessor, and this does not seem very likely.

There is therefore some reason to believe that the Malmesbury text preserves at least part of the wording of an authentic charter of Cuthred, the name of the abbot of the time, and a genuine but probably abbreviated witness list. This goes some way towards establishing that the surviving charter is basically authentic.

The land granted by Cuthred to Malmesbury is described as 10 hides 'in loco qui dicitur Wdetun', and is presumably the estate at Wootton Bassett which is the subject of the fabricated charter in the name of Coenfrith discussed above (S1166). But it seems unlikely that this document is a second fabrication drawn up at the same time and for the same reason as the charter of Coenfrith. Cuthred's charter, unlike that of Coenfrith, is not based on any other extant charter in the Malmesbury archive. None of the people named in this charter appears in any other Malmesbury charter, and none of the wording is duplicated. Cuthred's rather unusual title, 'rex Gewisorum', also occurs in a charter recording Æthelwulf's grant of Tockenham to Malmesbury (S306), but the same title also occurs in a charter of Cuthred's successor, Cyniwulf, extant in another cartulary (S262), and could well have been used by eighth-century writers, either because it still represented current usage, or because they took it from Bede (HE III 7, IV 16). This is the only noticeable instance of the recurrence of a phrase from Cuthred's charter in another Malmesbury text, and the evidence strongly suggests that this document was not fabricated by the same person or in the same circumstances as the charter of Coenfrith.

Secondly, and again unlike the Coenfrith charter, this text contains

no identifiable anachronisms. Some of the wording seems distinctly odd: 'cogente caritatis cathena Cristi'; 'ob recordationem scilicet orationum suarum'; 'ut in plenitudine electorum dei collocatus sim'; 'sub contestatione sancte trinitatis . dapsili quidem libertate et hylariter'; .but nothing in it is typical of, or exclusive to, the usage of a later age. To judge from the charters of Leuthere and Coenfrith, forgers at Malmesbury were not very skilful, and it is unlikely that a tenth or eleventh-century writer could have produced a document so entirely free from the characteristics of his own time.

Theoretically, a forger might have taken an authentic charter of Cuthred relating to some other estate and interpolated into it the name and hidage of Wootton Bassett. But this seems unlikely because the description of the estate is one of the clauses for which there is an eighth-century parallel, and it does not seem probable that an interpolator would have preserved this wording. Similarly, there is no likelihood that a grant to someone else has been altered to make it a grant to Malmesbury since there are repeated allusions throughout the text to the monastic beneficiary, and again some of these clauses have eighth-century parallels.

On the whole, the probability seems to be that this is an authentic charter of Cuthred. If so, it suggests that Cuthred was in effective control of Wiltshire in 745 since he granted land there to a monastery on the Mercian border, and neither he nor the Malmesbury community secured the agreement of Æthilbald. This tends to suggest that Cuthred had already made some progress in establishing West Saxon independence, although a northern chronicler dated his revolt against Æthilbald to 750 (Continuatio Baedae s.a. 750). The document also suggests that an abbot of Malmesbury in the eighth century was a relative of Aldhelm. This circumstance carries the implication that Malmesbury during its

earliest years was a family monastery, and that the house and its lands were considered to be family property and inherited as such, as was the case with certain other monasteries of the time, for example the one founded on the Stour in Worcestershire by Cyniberht in 736 and inherited by his son, Ceolfriðh (S89, 1411) and the house in Gloucestershire left by abbess Dunne to her granddaughter (S1429, 1255).

* * * * *

S260

Bodleian, Wood empt. 5, fo. 23rv.

(Edition: B185)

A charter of king Cyniwulf granting land to the community of Malmesbury in 758 seems to be entirely authentic. It survives in the cartularies and the Gesta Pontificum. There is no proem or sanction and the text has perhaps been abbreviated by a copyist.

An unusual feature of the wording is its reference to the consent of noblemen named above, 'supra', which suggests an unusual layout of the original with the witnesses at the top, unless it is merely a slip of the pen by the author or a copyist. It may be that the author was referring to a witness list drawn up at the time of the transaction and before the charter was written. However, the layout, if originally unusual, has been normalised in the extant cartulary copies, with the witness list at the end of the text. William of Malmesbury, in accordance with his usual practice, does not quote the witness list, but merely adds a brief note of some names and titles. In other respects the wording is quite normal, consisting chiefly of standard formulas. The grant is made to Malmesbury, and the charter resembles other mid-eighth century grants to Malmesbury and Glastonbury in citing the familia

of Christ in the monastery as the beneficiary. The estate is described as situated at the confluence of two named streams and in the surrounding area. There is a reference to local knowledge of boundaries which foreshadows the development of boundary clauses later in this reign, and a list of the components of the estate, 'pascua . prata ..' follows. The dates, 758 and the 11th indiction, are consistent.

The witness list is slightly unusual in that the order of names mixes up churchmen and laymen, but it may be that the original arrangement has become confused in copying, possibly in connection with the normalisation of layout suggested above. The attestations of bishops Cyniheard of Winchester and Herewald of Sherborne follow that of the king. Both bishops attest a charter of Æthilbald of Mercia of the preceding year (S96) and a number of later charters of Cyniwulf's reign (S260-2, 265, 1256). The next three witnesses, Eoppa, Ealhfrith and abbot Hereca, also attest Æthilbald's charter, and abbot Hereca is mentioned in a letter which a monk of his community wrote to Lul (Tangl no. 135). Eoppa also appears in later charters of Cyniwulf, while Ealhfrith witnesses another of the same year (S261, 262, 265). Abbot Beorn and Ynta are otherwise unknown. The practice of distinguishing lay and clerical witnesses by their attestation forms, which was usual in earlier West Saxon charters, does not appear here, and was apparently gradually discontinued during the eighth century. The witness list seems to be entirely authentic, although it may well have been abbreviated.

The estate granted by Cyniwulf consisted of 30 hides at the confluence of two streams named 'Mearcdaeno' and 'Reodburna'. These names survive in the modern place-names Moredon and Rodbourne (Not to be confused with Rodbourne south of Malmesbury: see under S243 above), which are now suburbs in the northern part of Swindon. There is no evidence to suggest that Malmesbury owned the land in later years, and this

estate does not seem to have survived as a unit. An estate of 20 hides at Moredon was granted to successive laymen in the tenth century in charters now surviving in the archives of Winchester and Abingdon, and was apparently the property of Abingdon at the beginning of the eleventh century (S486, 638, 705, 763, 1376; S918). Rodbourne does not recur in pre-Conquest charters. In 1066 both Moredon and Rodbourne were in lay hands and were assessed at 10 and 5 hides respectively (DB Wiltshire, pp. 26.9, 29.6, 43.1; 28.9).

Since there is nothing suspicious in the wording or content of this charter, and no identifiable motive for forgery, there seems little doubt that the document is authentic. The absence of any Mercian involvement confirms that Cyniwulf was an independent king and in control of Wiltshire at this date.

* * * * *

S149

Bodleian, Wood empt. 5, fos. 23v-25r.

(Edition: B279)

A charter dating from the brief reign of Ecgfrith of Mercia, 26th July to 14th December 796, survives in the cartularies and the Gesta Pontificum. It relates to an estate at Purton, Wiltshire, which had been taken from Malmesbury by Offa and was now restored by his son at the request of Beorhtric, king of the West Saxons, and Æthilheard, archbishop of Canterbury. The charter has been regarded with suspicion (Stevenson, Asser, p. 201; Whitelock, S149), but is probably authentic.

Ecgfrith's grant was made to abbot Cuthberht and the monks of Malmesbury. This abbot is not mentioned elsewhere in Malmesbury records, but is probably to be identified with the abbot Cuthberht who attended

the synod of Clofesho in 803 and appears in the remarkable witness list appended to an original charter deriving from that council in the section relating to the diocese of Winchester (8312). The active involvement of Beorhtric in this transaction probably reflects the fact that the estate and the monastery were both in Wessex. Moreover, it may be that Ecgfrith, at the beginning of his reign, was ready to accept the advice of a man who was his brother-in-law and neighbour, had been his father's ally, and had ten years' experience of kingship. Archbishop Æthilheard may have been visiting Mercia in the normal course of his duties, or may already have fled from the Kentish revolt which followed Offa's death.

The witness list is headed by the two kings, queen Eadburh, wife of Beorhtric and sister of Ecgfrith, and the archbishop. Then there follow the names of four bishops, all consistent with the date of the charter. Cyniberht of Winchester subscribed the report of the papal legates in 786 and attested three charters of Beorhtric's reign, two of them dating from 801; in the same year he accompanied archbishop Æthilheard to Rome (EHD, no. 191; S268, 269, 270a; ASC s.a. 801). Denefrith of Sherborne attended the synod of Clofesho in 794 and attests an original charter of Offa of 792 x 796 (S137, 139; the latter also derives from a synod at Clofesho, possibly the same one). His name occurs in no later record and by 801 his successor, Wigberht, held the see (S268, 270a). Heathored of Worcester appears in numerous charters, including texts of undoubted authenticity dating from both before and after this grant (Eg. S139, 153). Eadwulf, described here as bishop elect, was the successor of Ceolwulf of Lindsey who died in 796, and he held the see for many years (ASC, Historia Regum s.a. 796; S153, 155, 173, 1434, etc.). Six laymen attest the charter. The first five are Mercians, all of whom attest charters of both Offa and Coenwulf

(S139, 153, 155, etc.), and the last is the West Saxon ealdorman Wigfrith who was active throughout the reigns of Cyniwulf and Beorhtric (S96, 261, 264, 269, etc.). There were probably other West Saxon lay witnesses whose names have been dropped by a copyist. This witness list appears to be genuine, and its authenticity is confirmed by the close correspondence of the witness list of another charter of Ecgfrith, surviving in the Worcester cartulary (S148). Seven of the Malmesbury witnesses appear in the other list: the two kings, the archbishop, bishop Heathored, bishop elect Eadwulf and the laymen Brorda and Æthilmund. Two other men, not in the Malmesbury list, also subscribe.

There are no anachronisms in the wording of Ecgfrith's grant to Malmesbury. The text is dated by a regnal year as well as an indiction and year of grace, and regnal years commonly occur in the charters of Ecgfrith's successor, Coenwulf (S153, 155, 161, etc.). The estate is made free of all secular royal services, as is the case in other charters of this period (S41, 165, 187), and the price paid by Malmesbury for it is mentioned, which again has contemporary parallels (S155, 268, 269, etc.).

The estate is described as 35 hides 'in loco qui uocatur aec Piergean ab orientali parte silue que appellatur Braden', now Purton in Wiltshire, about 8 miles east of Malmesbury. The monastery evidently retained the estate from this time, and still owned it in 1066 (S305, 1038; DB Wiltshire, p. 8.13). According to William of Malmesbury and the pancarta dated 1065, Purton was originally granted to Malmesbury by Ceadwalla. This statement is presumably based on the fuller and more dubious version of Ceadwalla's charter of 688 which includes a grant of 30 hides east of Braydon wood (GP, p. 388; S1038; S234). It is far from certain that Ceadwalla did grant this land, but the description

of the estate, with its different hidage and no place-name, could well derive from an early charter. William of Malmesbury states that Offa seized Tetbury as well as Purton and gave the former to Worcester (GP, p. 388). This statement probably derives from Worcester records.

A list of grants to Worcester surviving in an eleventh-century cartulary of the house, now British Library, Cotton Nero E i, includes Offa's gifts of Tetbury and Purton (Bl320). Tetbury had been granted to Malmesbury by Æthilred of Mercia in 681, but does not recur in Malmesbury records. It was owned by a layman in 1066 (DB Gloucestershire, p. 41.2). It appears that Offa took two estates from Malmesbury, and that the house attempted to recover them but only succeeded in regaining one, and that only on payment of a substantial sum of money.

Three other charters of the late eighth century record the settlement of disputes arising out of the seizing or claiming of lands by Offa. A Worcester document of 781 explains that Bath and several other monasteries with their estates, the property of Worcester, were claimed by Offa, and that it was eventually agreed that Offa would take Bath and one other estate, while Worcester retained the other lands, this being a roughly equal division of the property (Sl257). The monastery of Cookham in Berkshire, owned by Christ Church, Canterbury, was first claimed by Cyniwulf of Wessex, then seized by Offa and retained by him for the rest of his life. At the synod of Clofesho in 798 archbishop Æthilheard finally agreed that Cynithryth, abbess of Cookham (and probably Offa's widow), should retain the monastery, but she handed certain estates over to him in exchange (Sl258). In 799 Coenwulf of Mercia restored to Christ Church several estates which had formerly been seized by Offa, in consideration of a payment of money (Sl55). The similarity of the background and content of the Malmesbury charter to those of the Worcester and Christ Church documents establishes a strong presumption

of the authenticity of Ecgrith's charter. It is probable that there had been a dispute between Worcester and Malmesbury over ownership of both Tetbury and Purton, and that this was settled by division of the property between the two. The agreement resembles those concerning Bath and Cookham in involving a division of property between the parties, and is like the other Canterbury settlement in being a restoration of property to its original owners in return for a cash payment.

The settlement of the dispute concerning the Malmesbury estates may have reflected an agreement between Beorhtric and Ecgrith on the demarkation of the West Saxon/Mercian border. Purton, situated in Wiltshire due east of Malmesbury was restored to the West Saxon monastery. Tetbury, originally the grant of a Mercian king and situated to the north of the monastery, was not given back, and was presumably retained by Worcester. This would be a logical arrangement if the border was near Malmesbury. The date when Offa took these estates from Malmesbury is nowhere stated, but was perhaps during the reign of Cyniwulf, when Offa defeated the West Saxons in battle and extended Mercian territory in the Thames valley (ASC s.a. 779; S1258). It may well be that other sections of the northern border of Wessex were assailed at this time and other territories annexed. The settlement of 796 suggests, however, that Mercia agreed to give up some part of the conquered land, either late in Offa's reign or after his death.

* * * * *

Appendix: S96

British Library, Cotton Charter VIII 3.

(Edition: Bl81)

A charter recording a grant of Æthilbald, king of the Mercians, to an abbot named Eanberht survives only on a single sheet of unknown provenance. The document is in poor condition and the beginning of the text is lost: only a few words of the proem can be read, it is impossible to tell whether there was an invocation, and the beginning of the dispositio is slightly obscured. Various dates have been assigned to the manuscript. The latest published opinion, that of Ker and Bishop in Sawyer's handlist, is that the document is tenth-century. Professor T. Julian Brown, however, observes that, if tenth-century, the manuscript is a very good fake; it looks early, eighth- or ninth-century, and could be an original (personal comment).

The text is not dated, but can be assigned to 757 on the evidence of the witness list which is headed by Æthilbald of Mercia and Cyniwulf of Wessex: Æthilbald's reign ended and Cyniwulf's began in this year (ASC, Historia Regum and Continuatio Baedae, s.a. 757). The extensive list of names which follows consists of the lay and clerical supporters of the two kings, and is authentic beyond any reasonable doubt. Three bishops attest, Herewald of Sherborne, Milred of Worcester and Cyniheard of Winchester. All three appear in numerous other charters of the mid-eighth century, and the Chronicle records that Cyniheard was consecrated in 756 and that Milred died in 774. There are 14 lay witnesses of

whom the first 8 appear to be Mercians, 5 of them known from their attestations of other Mercian charters (Heardberht (S89 90, 92, etc.); Eadbald (S92, 105, etc.); Eada (S92); Ealhmund (S91, 92); Ecgfrith (S241 which has a Mercian witness list appended to a spurious West Saxon charter); the others are West Saxon, appearing in other charters of Cyniwulf (See S264). In a separate column are listed 5 further churchmen. Abbot Tyccea is probably to be identified with abbot 'Tica' of Glastonbury who appears in the abbatial list of that house, and is named by William of Malmesbury as the beneficiary of a grant by king Sigiberht of Wessex (S1680; also probably the writer of Tangl no. 129). Abbot Hereca attests Cyniwulf's grant to Malmesbury discussed above. Abbot Cyniberht is probably the Mercian nobleman who founded a monastery on land at Ismere on the Stour in Worcestershire, granted by Æthilbald in 736 (S89; 1411; EHD, no. 67). The two priests Bægloc and Ecga are otherwise unknown, although it is possible that the latter is to be identified with Ecgwald, who was abbot of Tisbury in 759 (S1256).

Æthilbald is described in the dispositio as 'rex non solum Mercensium . sed etiam in circuitu populorum'. Close parallels for this wording are found in his original charter of 736 granting Ismere to Cyniberht: 'rex non solum Marcensium sed et omnium prouinciarum que generale nomine Sutangli dicuntur'; and in his undated grant to Æthilric of the Hwicce: 'Non solum Mercensium . sed et universarum provinciarum quæ communi vocabulo dicuntur . Suthengli (S89, 94). The estate granted to abbot Eanberht is given no name, and is defined by reference to adjacent landmarks, a wood and a tumulus. Similar descriptions of land are found both in the earliest West Saxon and in Æthilbald's other charters (S84, 89). The sanction is of a very common type asserting that any transgressor will render account at the Last Judgement, but

the wording in this charter resembles that in the Ismere charter in including the word 'terribiliter'. There are no anachronisms in the wording of Æthilbald's grant, which is brief and substantially composed of common formulas. It appears to be wholly genuine.

The monastery ruled by the beneficiary, abbot Eanberht, is not named in this document, but the same name occurs in Malmesbury's abbatial list, 'Æambriht', and the abbot of Malmesbury is probably to be identified with the recipient of this grant (Birch 1871, p. 318; also Wallenberg 1931, p. 42). The name is not very common. The position of the name in the abbatial list tends to suggest that Eanberht was an early abbot of the house, and there is no evidence to suggest that he was someone other than an abbot of Malmesbury. Charters involving kings of both Wessex and Mercia usually relate to border situations, and it is not unreasonable that a grant to the border monastery of Malmesbury should have been made at a meeting where both kings were present to witness and confirm it. And it seems that the land granted was situated only a few miles from Malmesbury.

The estate is described as 10 hides 'iuxta siluan quam dicunt Toccan Sceaga habens in proximo tumulum qui habet nomen Readā Beorg'. The identification of 'Toccan Sceaga' with Tockenham in Wiltshire was first suggested by Dr. J.K. Wallenberg in 1931, was endorsed by Finberg in 1964, and is now generally accepted (Wallenberg 1931, pp. 41-3; ECW, no. 189; VCH Wiltshire, p. 5 n. 24. 596; EHD, p. 19; Stenton 1971, p. 204). Tockenham is less than 10 miles from Malmesbury, and occurs in Malmesbury records. A dubious charter in the name of Æthelwulf records a grant of 5 hides at Tockenham to Malmesbury; in 1066 the estate was assessed at 10 hides and portions of it were held by a number of laymen, one of them holding 5 hides from the church of Malmesbury (S306; DB Wiltshire, pp. 30.2, 41.2, 67.20, 27, 31).

The history of the estate from the time of Æthilbald's grant is unclear, but the probability seems to be that the grant of 757 was to Malmesbury which subsequently managed to retain at least part of the estate.

This charter has long been considered evidence of the subordination of Cyniwulf of Wessex to Æthilbald of Mercia (Stenton 1918, pp. 57-8; Stenton 1971, p. 204; ECW, p. 218; EHD, p. 19). Three features of the text are cited in support of this view: firstly Æthilbald's royal style with its reference to the peoples around Mercia; secondly Cyniwulf's attestation of Æthilbald's grant; and thirdly the fact that Æthilbald was granting land in Wessex. But it is not certain that the text will support the interpretation which has been placed on it. The peoples whom Æthilbald claimed to rule are not specified, and may not have included the West Saxons. Moreover, Cyniwulf is unlikely to have been able to read and probably knew nothing of the precise terms in which this charter was drawn up, so that, even if Æthilbald's title was intended to claim dominance over Wessex, Cyniwulf's attestation would not indicate his acceptance of the claim. Cyniwulf's subscription in itself provides no information about the balance of power between Mercia and Wessex. The beneficiary probably took care to have the charter attested by the West Saxon king because the estate lay in Wessex: Cyniwulf's recognition of the grant would be necessary if the new owner was to be secure in his possession of it. Æthilbald's ownership of the estate may have dated from a time when he did exercise power in Wessex, but he chose to hand it over to a monastery, and probably the West Saxon monastery of Malmesbury. This appears to be a conciliatory gesture, and suggests that Æthilbald had no aggressive intentions towards Wessex in 757. His assassination by his own men later in the same year suggests that his power was declining, which is scarcely surprising after a reign of 41 years.

There is no direct evidence to tell us where or why the meeting now recorded only in the witness list of this charter took place. It may be reasonably assumed that so many eminent persons did not assemble for the sole purpose of granting 10 hides of land to a monastery. Probably this meeting should be regarded as one of the events inaugurating the reign of Cyniwulf. Æthilbald may have agreed to meet his new neighbour and recognise him as king of the West Saxons following the overthrow of Sigiberht. It is not likely that any agreement between Æthilbald and Cuthred or Sigiberht would be automatically accepted by Cyniwulf, and the beginning of the new reign would involve the need for negotiations between the kings of Mercia and Wessex on all matters affecting the relationship between their kingdoms. Such negotiations could well have been conducted by the men recorded in this witness list, in which the kings appear to be attended by most of their leading lay and clerical supporters.

(d) Conclusions

There survive 13 charters and one papal bull relating to Malmesbury in the period down to 796. There is no charter evidence for Malmesbury from 797 to 839. Of the 14 extant documents, three appear to be fabrications: the grants of bishop Leuthere and the comes Coenfrith to Aldhelm, and Aldhelm's agreement to retain the abbacy of his monasteries in 705. Two other charters appear not to be separate documents, but are merely revised versions of charters of Æthilred and Ceadwalla (S73, 234). The remaining 9 documents seem to be substantially genuine, although some are probably interpolated. Interest in Aldhelm's career seems to have been one of the motives for two of the fabricated documents, and may also account for the survival of so many authentic charters dating from his abbacy.

No foundation charter survives, and the date when the monastery was founded is unknown, but it existed by 681 when Æthilred of Mercia granted land to Aldhelm. During the reign of Centwine of Wessex, c. 676-c.686, Malmesbury received patronage from both sides of the border, and it is not possible to determine whether it was a Mercian or a West Saxon benefactor who made the earliest grant, or whether the house was originally a Mercian or a West Saxon establishment. The earliest charters, however, tend to suggest that the monastery was basically West Saxon, since their witness lists consistently use the subscription form 'Signum manus X' for all laymen including kings, and subscriptions of the 'Ego X subscripsi' type for churchmen; this distinction was a West Saxon, not a Mercian, practice.

Aldhelm appears as abbot in the earliest charters, and was believed to have been the first abbot of the house by the compiler of the abbatial list and the author of the spurious charter of Leuthere. It is argued above that William of Malmesbury's theory of the earlier Irish founder-abbot, Maildub, is an error based on a mistranslation of a passage in pope Sergius' privilege. There is no valid evidence for the existence of a monastery at Malmesbury before Aldhelm's time, and the probability is that he founded the house. William of Malmesbury reports the tradition that the second abbot Aldhelm, active in the reign of Cuthred, was nephew to the first, and it may be that Malmesbury was originally a family monastery. It is noticeable that the names of the first four recorded abbots alliterate: Aldhelm (or Ealdhelm), Eaba, Aldhelm II and Eanberht. A second monastery at Frome was also under Aldhelm's control, and it is quite possible that there were other monasteries connected with Malmesbury, although there is no early evidence for any other, unless the church at Bradford-upon-Avon is interpreted as such.

Ceadwalla's military successes seem to have moved the West Saxon border further north and brought Malmesbury more firmly into the West Saxon orbit. For many years after his reign the only recorded grants to Malmesbury were made by West Saxon donors; Malmesbury was evidently included among the beneficiaries of Ine's general grant of privileges in 704; and Aldhelm was consecrated to a West Saxon see in 705. But Aldhelm's efforts during the reigns of Ine of Wessex and Æthilred of Mercia to secure from both rulers an agreement of immunity for Malmesbury in the event of war suggests that the monastery was still effectively in a border situation; and this is also indicated by the evidence for the second half of the eighth century, when grants were made by Mercian kings at meetings attended by West Saxon kings. Only at the time of Offa's depredations is there reason to think that Malmesbury was under Mercian control. An earlier takeover of the area by Æthilbald is possible, but there is a gap in the evidence from 706 to 744. Most of the seventh- and eighth-century charters are consistent with the theory that Malmesbury was a West Saxon establishment situated near the border with Mercia and usually maintaining amicable contact with the Mercian ruling house.

3. WINCHESTER

	<u>Page</u>
a) <u>Introduction</u>	209
b) <u>The Charters</u>	210
<u>S</u>	
229 Coenwalh, king, to Winchester	211
235 Ceadwalla, king, to Ceadda, Cisi and Criswa	213
242 Ine, king, to Winchester	220
254 Æthilheard, king, to Winchester	223
258, 259 Cuthred, king, to Winchester	225
1263 Ealhmund, bishop, to Berhthelm	230
Charters of Ecgberht: Introduction	233
283 Ecgberht, king, to Wulfheard	238
273 Ecgberht, king, to Winchester	241
272 Ecgberht, king, to Winchester	246
274 Ecgberht, king, to Winchester	250
276 Ecgberht, king, to Winchester	252
281 Ecgberht, king, to Winchester	253
Charters of Ecgberht: Summary	258
c) <u>Lost Charters</u>	259
d) <u>Conclusions</u>	262

(a) Introduction

The cartulary of the episcopal see of Winchester, now Additional Manuscript 15350 in the British Library, is known as the Codex Wintoniensis and is the earliest extant West Saxon cartulary, dating from c.1130 x 1150. The manuscript and its contents have been described briefly by Davis and more fully by Hart and Rumble (Davis 1958, no. 1042; Hart 1970; Rumble 1981). The cartulary is a handsome manuscript written in book hand with decorated initials and contains an extensive collection of pre-Conquest charters, with a few post-Conquest documents added at the end. The Anglo-Saxon charters, over 200 documents relating to the period from the seventh century to the eleventh, are arranged according to the names of the estates concerned, but in some cases the resulting groupings are erroneous, different places of the same name being grouped together. Many of the charters relate to estates which appear never to have been part of the Winchester endowment, and these were presumably deposited by lay owners for safe-keeping at the episcopal see (Cf. Hart 1970 where it is suggested that these documents represent a royal archive consisting of copies of royal grants). Some of the charters survive also on single sheets, and comparison of the texts shows that the twelfth-century cartularist transcribed his exemplars accurately and fully, even incorporating the information of endorsements into his rubrics. However, all the charters relating to the period down to 839 which are discussed individually below survive only in the cartulary.

(b) The Charters

The extant charters relating to the period down to 839 are listed below.

<u>S</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Donor</u>	<u>Beneficiary</u>
229	c. 641 x c. 672	Coenwalh, king	Winchester
235	688	Ceadwalla, king	Ceadda, Cisi and Criswa
242	701	Ine, king	Winchester
254	737	Æthilheard, king	Winchester
258	749	Cuthred, king	Winchester
259	749	Cuthred, king	Winchester
1263	801 x 811	Ealhmund, bishop	Berthelm
283	824	Ecgerht, king	Wulfheard
273	825	Ecgerht, king	Winchester
272	825	Ecgerht, king	Winchester
275	826	Ecgerht, king	Winchester
274	826	Ecgerht, king	Winchester
276	826	Ecgerht, king	Winchester
284	802 x 839	Ecgerht, king	Winchester
281	838	Ecgerht, king	Winchester

S229

B.L. Additional 15350, fos. 13v-14r.

(Edition: B27)

The document which purports to be the oldest charter in the Winchester cartulary is a grant of an estate at Downton in Wiltshire in the name of Coenwalh, king of the West Saxons (c.641-c.672). It appears to be wholly spurious.

The wording is hopelessly anachronistic in a document which is supposed to date from the seventh century. It includes pretentious phraseology such as was not used at such an early date, for example in the king's title, 'ego Cyneualc . alti throni annuente moderatoris imperio rex Occidentalium Saxonum'. Some of the words used are characteristic of tenth-century writing, such as rus, where an early charter would have terra, and mansae rather than cassati or manentes. There is an immunity clause with the three exceptions which do not occur in authentic charters before the eighth century and only became common in the ninth. Similarly the clause qualifying the sanction, 'nisi hic digna satisfactione celeriter emendare curauerit', is a feature which only occurs from the ninth century onwards. The estate is defined by means of a lengthy boundary clause in Old English, and the land is granted to an institution, the church of St. Peter and St. Paul at Winchester, whereas the earliest genuine West Saxon charters were normally worded as grants to individuals. Clearly this text was not drafted in the seventh century.

The entire wording, except for the witness list, is duplicated almost exactly in a charter purporting to be Ecgberht's confirmation of Coenwalh's grant (S275). The Old English bounds also occur in another confirmatory charter in the name of Eadred (S540). Much of the wording occurs, without the bounds, in a spurious charter relating

to an alleged grant by Æthelwulf to Winchester of another Wiltshire estate, and there is some similarity of wording in another Winchester charter in Æthelwulf's name (S312, 317). But the only parallels of wording found in other archives are in charters of the tenth century: the royal title resembles one used in charters of Eadwig surviving at Abingdon and Bath (S607, 627); the opening clause also occurs in a charter of Eadgar now lost but formerly at Westminster Abbey (S805; cf. also S657, 1663); and similarly-worded immunities appear in numerous tenth-century charters (Eg. S581, 690, 771). The evidence therefore suggests that this document was drawn up in the tenth century. It was probably written not earlier than the time of bishop Æthelwold when the reformed community began to take an interest in the early history of the see (ECW, pp. 214-48).

Appended to the charter is a witness list in which the only name appropriate to a grant of Coenwalh is that of the king himself. The rest of the list is neither West Saxon nor seventh-century, but consists of Mercian churchmen and laymen active in the closing years of Offa's reign. Two archbishops attest, Æthilheard of Canterbury who was elected in 792, and Hygeberht, holder of the short-lived archiepiscopal see of Lichfield. The three bishops are Ceolwulf of Lindsey, who died in 796 (Historia Regum s.a. 796), Heathored of Worcester and Unwona of Leicester. Brorda and Lulling were Mercian ealdormen (S139, 148, 149, 153, 155). The last witness, 'Vibald comes', is not securely identified but may, as Finberg suggests, be the 'Þynbald comes' who attests a charter of 805 (S161; ECW, no. 195). These names have presumably been taken from an authentic document of 792 x 796, probably a charter of Offa or a record of a synod, but this does not survive and the transaction recorded in it is unknown. There is no reason to suppose that its content is reflected in that of the extant charter

in Coenwalh's name (Cf. ECW, no. 195 and p. 218).

Downton was bequeathed to the see of Winchester by king Eadred, who died in 955, and the estate was still owned and was assessed at 100 hides, the amount mentioned in this charter, in 1066 (S1515; DB Wiltshire, p. 2.1). The earlier history of the manor is unknown, and none of the series of charters purporting to record its restoration to Winchester, or confirmation of the see's ownership by various kings appears to be authentic (S275, 376, 393, 540, 818, 821, 891). The charter of Coenwalh may constitute valid evidence for Winchester in the tenth century, but has no relevance to the seventh.

* * * * *

S235

B.L. Additional 15350, fos. 57v-58r.

(Edition: B72)

A charter of Ceadwalla dated 688 in which he grants an estate at Farnham in Surrey to three laymen for the foundation of a monastery is the earliest authentic charter preserved in the Winchester cartulary, predating any extant genuine charter relating directly to Winchester itself. The basic authenticity of the document is beyond any reasonable doubt and has been generally accepted (Stevenson 1914, p. 703; Stenton 1918a, p. 53; ECW, p. 216; Stenton 1971, p. 70; Sawyer 1978, p. 143; ECTV, no. 312).

Since the grant was made to laymen, there was no motive for forgery of the document. The three men, Ceadda, Cisi and Criswa, were probably relatives proposing to establish a family monastery. Ceadda witnessed another early Surrey charter, Frithuwald's grant to Chertsey, in the early 670s (S1165). Cisi appears in witness lists with Ceadwalla

(S231, 234, 1170, 1248). Criswa is otherwise unknown. Dr. Margaret Gelling argues that the last name should be read as Crispa, 'an acceptable Old English name meaning 'curly' which occurs in place-names' (ECTV, no. 312). It is not easy to distinguish p and wyn in the hand of the scribe, but the curve of the downstroke suggests that wyn was intended here, and that the name should be read as Criswa ('Crispa'). This does not, however, preclude the possibility that the name appeared in the exemplar as 'Crispa' and was misread by the twelfth-century scribe of the cartulary. He did miscopy at least one name in this document: abbot Hagona, known from his attestations of several early charters (S45, 233, 245, 1171, 1248), appears here as 'Hugon', the scribe having apparently misread an open a as u. This suggests that his exemplar was in a hand of the eighth century or early ninth century, and is another indication of the authenticity of the charter (EHD, no. 58).

There is an extensive list of lay and clerical witnesses. The king's name, which is given as 'Ceadwal' in the dispositio, appears here as 'Cenwal', evidently by a slip of the pen; the date and witnesses suit Ceadwalla not Coenwalh. Three bishops subscribe, Wilfrid of Northumbria, Eorcenwald of Essex and Hæddi of Wessex. These are followed by three abbots, Aldhelm, Hagona and Eadberht of Selsey. There are four priests, of whom only one, Guda, is recorded elsewhere: he witnessed Ædilred's grant to Barking a few years later, and was then described as priest and abbot (S1171). The second column of witnesses consists of nine laymen of whom four appear in other witness lists, Wudda, Teoda, and Snocca in charters of the reign of Ceadwalla, and Coen in Ine's general grant of privileges of 704 (S233, 1170; S245). Twelve of the twenty-one witnesses and all three of the beneficiaries of this charter have names formed from only a single name element.

Such names were less common in the eighth century and virtually disappear thereafter, names formed of two elements becoming standard (Smart 1981, pp. xiii-xv), so that a writer of later date could not easily have drawn up such a list as this, nor would he have known the names of the various obscure but identifiable men included in it. The attestation forms strictly preserve the distinction of lay and clerical witnesses. The whole list is clearly authentic.

The wording of this charter strikingly resembles that of two other early grants, those of Frithuwald to Chertsey and of Ædilred to Barking. The proem is an unusual one, closely paralleled only in Frithuwald's charter, but similar to that in Ædilred's grant, which appears to be based on one used by Gregory the Great (Gregory's grant of 587 to the monastery of St. Andrea: Hartmann, Gregory, pp. 437-9); there are also some echoes of the wording in a grant of Nothhelm of Sussex to his sister:-

S235: 'Quocienscumque aliquid pro opere pietatis Cristi membris impendimus nostre anime fore prodesse credimus quia sua illi reddimus non nostra largimur.'

S1165: 'Quotienscunque aliqua pro opere pietatis membris Chræsti impendimus nostræ animæ prodesse credimus . quia sua illi reddimus et nostra non largimur .'

S1171: 'Quotiens sanctis ac uenerabilibus locis uestris Aliquid offerre uidemur Uestra uobis reddimus non nostra largimur .'

Gregory: 'Quotiens laudis uestrae usibus licet parua quaedam conferimus, uestra uobis reddimus, non nostra largimur'

S45: 'sciens mihi in futuro prodesse quicquid Christi membris de mea propria possessione impendo'.

The sanction includes both a prohibitive clause and a penal clause. The former is a feature of a few early West Saxon charters (S240, 244 , 1176, 1249), but the wording here closely resembles only that in Frithuwald's charter:-

S235: 'Numquam ego heredesque mei ullo tempore contra hanc donationis cartulam uenire temptauerit .'

S1165: 'Nunquam me ullo tempore hæredeque meo contra hanc donacionis meæ cartulam esse venturis .'

The penal clause is of a comparatively rare type, but similar wordings occur in the grants of Frithuwald and Ædilred and in the earliest extant original Anglo-Saxon charter, king Hlothere's grant of 679 to abbot Berhtwald of Reculver:-

S235: 'Quod si quis superba presumpserit inruptione infringere aut minuire per tyrannidem hanc a me actam donationem sit separatus ab omni societate Cristiana ! manentem uero in sua nichilominus firmitate'

S1165: 'Quod si quis contra hanc donacionem meam et confirmacionem venire temptaverit ! sit hic separatus ab omni societate Christiana et a coelestis regni participatione privetur .'

S1171: 'Si quis contra hanc donationis cartulam venire temptaverit aut corrumpere Ante omnipotentem Deum . . . Sciat se condemnatum et separatum ab omni societate Christian[a]M[anentem] hanc kartulam donationis in sua nihilominus firmitate .'

S8: 'quisquis contra hanc donationem uenire temptauerit sit ab omni Christianitata separatus . . . manentem hanc donationis chartulam in sua nihilominus firmitate .'

Versions of the last phrase, 'manentem uero in sua nichilominus firmitate', occur in some other seventh-century Kentish charters (S7, 9, 10, 12, 16).

There is a list of the component parts of the estate: 'Cum omnibus ad se pertinentibus . campis . siluis . pratis . pascuis . piscariis . fluminibus . fontanis'. This type of list, derived from the late Roman private deed, commonly occurs in seventh-century and early eighth-century Anglo-Saxon charters of the south-east (S7, 8, 10, 45, 65, 1165, 1171, etc.), but not in those of Wessex. The clause 'libertam a me habeatis licenciam donandi commutandi' is similar to phrases occurring in other early charters of Surrey and Essex (S1165: 'liberam licenciam habeatis'; S65, 1171, 1788: 'liberam habeatis (habeat, habeas) potestatem'; also S1164, a West Saxon charter whose diplomatic is connected with that of Essex: 'liberam et firmam habeat potestatem').

This charter is of the type sometimes called the epistola, that is one in which the beneficiaries are addressed in the second person: 'ego Ceadwal ... terram uobis ... confero'. This type of wording appears in at least one charter from every province of Anglo-Saxon England from which charters of the period 670-760 survive. After 760 the wording became very common in Kent but fell wholly out of use elsewhere. The non-Kentish charters drafted in this way are listed below:-

<u>S</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Donor</u>	<u>Monastery of Beneficiary</u>
<u>Essex and Surrey</u>			
1165	672 x 674	Frithuwald	Chertsey
235	688	Ceadwalla	Farnham
1171	c690 x 693	Ædilred	Barking
1783	693 x 704	Æthilred	London
1784	c704 x 709	Offa	London
1788	716 x 745	Æthilbald	London
<u>Mercia</u>			
1168	c672	Wigheard	? (Beorngyth's)
1167	681	Æthilmod	? (Beorngyth's)
1799	674 x 704	Merchelm et al.	Much Wenlock
1177	704 x 709	Æthilheard et al.	? (Cuthswith's)
1800	709 x 716	Ceolred	Much Wenlock
56	759	Eanberht et al.	? (Headda's)
<u>Sussex</u>			
45	688 x 705	Nothhelm	? (Nothgyth's)
<u>Wessex</u>			
240	693	Ine	Muchelney

The single West Saxon example is a dubious charter which survives in a very garbled form but probably has some authentic basis.

It is fairly clear that the diplomatic of Ceadwalla's charter is that of the south-east rather than the south-west, and that its closest affinities are with the earliest extant charters of Eorcenwald's establishments at Chertsey and Barking. It is possible that this document and the charters of Frithuwald and Ædilred were all written by members of Eorcenwald's community. Ceadwalla's charter may have been drawn up in a scriptorium at Chertsey or London. The correspondence of formula in other early charters appear to indicate that the text is preserved substantially as it was first drafted. The only detail in it which could be considered anachronistic is the incarnational date, which is unlikely to have been used in a seventh-century Anglo-Saxon charter (Cf. Harrison 1976, pp. 71-2). It is given as 688 and agrees with the indiction but has probably been added to the text. The authenticity or accuracy of the indiction has also been doubted, on the grounds that there is no evidence for Wilfrid's presence in the south in 688 (ECTV, no. 312; S235). But this objection is of doubtful validity, because it can scarcely be supposed that we possess a complete account of all Wilfrid's travels, and it is quite possible that he visited Ceadwalla in Wessex in 688.

The land conveyed consists of 60 hides at 'Fernham', now Farnham in Surrey. Of these 60 hides 10 are at 'Bintungom', now represented by Binton Farm about 3 miles east of Farnham; 2 are at 'Cert', now Churt, 5-6 miles south of Farnham (PN Surrey, pp. 178, 181); and the rest are said to be in other places having their own names, 'hoc est Cusanweoh'. It appears that there should have been other names after 'Cusanweoh', which is unidentified; they were perhaps unknown to the author of the document and never supplied afterwards (Sawyer 1978,

p. 143; ECTV, no. 312). Or just possibly they have been dropped by a copyist as unimportant or unintelligible.

The estate, known in later years simply as Farnham, had come into the possession of Winchester by the beginning of the ninth century. It was temporarily alienated twice: at the beginning of the ninth century (801 x 811) bishop Ealhmund granted it to a layman in exchange for other lands, and in 858 bishop Swithun granted it to king Æthelbald for his lifetime (S1263; S1274). On both occasions provision was made for the reversion of the estate to Winchester, and it was recovered and was held by the see in 1066 (S382, 818, 823; DB Surrey, p. 3.1). All records relating to Farnham down to 1086 describe it as an estate of 60 hides.

It is very unusual to find that an estate granted in the seventh century is identical in name and hidage with a Domesday manor. Charters making such claims are often spurious or interpolated. In the present case the charter is clearly authentic, but it is just possible that the name of Farnham and the figure of 60 hides have been introduced into it at a later date in order to modernise the description of the land. There is no reason to suppose, however, that the document has been altered in substance. The names of Binton and Churt show that the estate was in the Farnham area, and it is probable that a substantial area was granted. Ceadwalla is known to have made grants to churchmen of other extensive estates in areas outside Wessex which he had acquired by conquest: innumerable pieces of land in Sussex to Wilfrid for his monastery at Selsey (Colgrave, Wilfrid, ch. XLII, p. 84); 300 hides on the Isle of Wight, also to Wilfrid (HE IV 16); and 100 hides at Kemble in Gloucestershire to Malmesbury (S231). And the Surrey estate consisted largely of poor quality land of little value; (the name Churt actually means rough, uncultivated and overgrown with gorse,

broom or bracken (PN Surrey, pp. 178, 350)).

Narrative sources record that Ceadwalla ravaged Kent in 686 and again in 687, and that he conquered and annexed Sussex and the Isle of Wight (ASC s.a. 686, 687; HE IV 15, 16). This charter shows that he also controlled Surrey, an area formerly under Mercian authority. It was probably part of his conquests, although it is also possible that the area had passed into West Saxon control during Centwine's reign. The presence of Eorcenwald, whom Ine was later to describe as 'my bishop' (Prologue to Ine's laws: Attenborough, Laws, p. 36), may indicate that Ceadwalla also exercised power in Essex. The attestation of Wilfrid immediately after that of the king tends to support Eddius' statement that Wilfrid was established by Ceadwalla as 'in omni regno suo excelsum consiliarium' (Colgrave, Wilfrid, ch. XLII, p. 84). And, if we may trust the charter's date and accept that Wilfrid was with Ceadwalla in 688, this suggests that Wilfrid was probably responsible for persuading Ceadwalla to abdicate and retire to Rome. The theory is endorsed by other considerations: Wilfrid's position as chief counsellor; his own habit of regarding Rome as a refuge; and his experience of visiting Rome, which qualified him to give the king all necessary information and advice on the subject.

* * * * *

S242

B.L. Additional 15350, fos. 20v.21r.

(Edition: B102)

A charter in the name of king Ine records the restoration to Winchester of an estate of 40 hides at Alresford in Hampshire, said to have been granted earlier by king Coenwalh. This document in many respects resembles

the Downton charter in the name of Coenwalh discussed above, and similarly appears to be a fabrication.

The name of a famous, early West Saxon king has been used and the date 701 chosen accordingly. But the text is recognisably tenth-century in its vocabulary and inflated style and in its content. It includes an immunity clause with the three usual exceptions and a sanction providing for the possibility of a transgressor making amends; the wording of both clauses resembles that of clauses in charters of the reign of Eadgar (Eg. S689, 695, 698, 700). There is a detailed Old English boundary clause, and the grant is made to the church at Winchester. This text, like that of the Downton charter, is duplicated almost word for word in other Winchester charters which also appear to be spurious, a charter in the name of Ecgerht relating to the same estate and a grant of another estate in the name of Æthelwulf (S284, 309).

The witness list appended to this charter has already been discussed above in connection with king Cuthred's grant to Malmesbury (S256). Like the witness list attached to the Downton charter in Coenwalh's name, this one appears to have been taken from a document which was of early date, but did not suit the pretended date of the charter to which it was then appended. The list is headed by bishop Daniel who was not consecrated to the see of Winchester until 705, and includes abbot Tunberht who held the abbacy of Glastonbury in the 740s, and an obscure layman, Puttock, who attests a charter of king Æthilheard of 739 (S1678, 1679, 1410; S255). The presence of these men suggests that this witness list is basically authentic and derives from a charter of the 730s or 740s. The last two attestations, those of king Cuthred and abbot Aldhelm (II of Malmesbury), may represent later confirmation of a charter of king Æthilheard, or it may be that the whole list originated in a charter of Cuthred: it is impossible to be certain whether the

subscriptions 'Signum manus Æpelheardi' and 'Signum manus Fortheres' are those of the king who succeeded Ine and the bishop of Sherborne who succeeded Aldhelm, or whether these are lay supporters of Cuthred who happened to have the same names as the earlier king and bishop. The list has clearly been tampered with: the subscription forms and the order of names appear to have been altered, and there has no doubt been some abbreviation. But the list could scarcely have been drawn up by a forger and is evidently basically authentic, although nothing is now known of the charter to which it originally belonged.

Alresford had evidently come into the possession of Winchester by the late ninth or early tenth century when bishop Denewulf leased it to a laymen named Ælfred for his lifetime (S1287). In 956 king Eadwig granted the estate to another layman, Ælfric, said to be the son of Ælfred, and on this occasion the grant was worded as a permanent alienation of the property (S589). However, Winchester recovered the estate and owned it in 1066 when it was assessed at 51 hides (DB Hampshire, p. 2.1). It was probably in connection with their efforts to regain Alresford after 956 that the community drew up the various spurious charters granting, confirming or restoring the estate to the church at Winchester, including the fabrication in Coenwalh's name (There are four such charters, S242, 284, 375, 814; the first three are certainly fabricated and the last is dubious. Alresford is also mentioned in the pancarta S818). There survives no reliable account of how Winchester originally acquired the estate.

* * * * *

S254

B.L. Additional 15350, fos. 60v-61r.

(Edition: B158).

A charter in the name of king Æthilheard dated 737 recounts that he was requested by queen Frithugyth to augment the estate at 'Tantun', Taunton in Somerset, which she had given to the church of St. Peter and St. Paul at Winchester. He therefore granted two areas of land, 4 hides at 'Piðiglea', now Withiel Florey, also in Somerset but more than 20 miles west of Taunton, and 3 hides at 'Cearn' which is not securely identified but was valued as a source of salt, and was probably somewhere on the Somerset coast. These 7 hides had been taken from their owners by the operations of justice because the owners were guilty of theft; old charters relating to the lands were of no validity and were not to be openly produced. There follows an immunity clause with the three usual exceptions, an Old English boundary clause for each of the two estates, and a witness list.

This charter is extremely dubious in wording and content, but the one part of it which seems to be basically authentic is the witness list. This consists of six subscriptions, each in the form 'Signum manus' plus a name and title, and has evidently been reworded, possibly in an attempt to copy the simplicity of the earliest charters. But there is no objection to any of the names. The six witnesses are Daniel, bishop of Winchester from 705 to c. 745; Forthere, bishop of Sherborne from 709 to 739 and perhaps some years longer (The date of his death is not recorded. He last appears in 739 (S255), and his successor, Herewald, first appears in 744 (S1410)); king Æthilheard; queen Frithugyth; Coengils, abbot of Glastonbury, who was the beneficiary of a grant of Æthilheard in 729 and also appears in correspondence (S253; Tangl no. 55; see also the lost charter S1677 and Glastonbury's abbatial

list, discussed above); and an abbess named Æscburh who is otherwise unknown. The first four of these names might have been taken from the Chronicle, but the last two could not, and it appears that the author of the extant document began with a genuine charter of Æthilheard, to which this list belonged.

It does not, however, appear that much, if any, of the wording or content of that charter survives in the text to which the witness list is now appended, as this is seriously anachronistic. The invocation is a very unusual wording which is not likely to have been used in the eighth century: 'Domino nostro Ihesu Cristo . cum coæterno patro et spiritu sancto . in eternum regnante'. The date follows. This is given only as an incarnational year and again the wording is unusual: 'Anno eiusdem redemptoris nostri dominice incarnationis . Dcc . xxxvii'. The year 737 may have originated in the same charter as the witness list, or may have been borrowed from that annal in the Chronicle which mentions queen Frithugyth's pilgrimage to Rome with bishop Forthere. Finberg rightly remarks that Frithugyth is most unlikely to have handed over to Winchester an estate which was situated in the heart of the comparatively new diocese of Sherborne (ECW, p. 217), and the account of the estates seems to have been drawn up at a much later date, since it makes use of the terms rus and mansae which are usual in charters of the tenth century, not those of the eighth. Confiscation of land as a punishment for theft is a feature of tenth-century legislation (VI Æthelstan 1: Attenborough, Laws, p. 156; III Eadgar 7.1: Robertson, Laws, p. 26; IV Eadgar 11: ibid., p. 36), but does not appear in early law codes. The immunity can scarcely be genuine as early as Æthilheard's reign, and its wording resembles that found in charters of Eadgar. The Old English boundary clauses are also clearly of later date. There is no sanction except for the clause forbidding the production of old

charters relating to these estates. Nothing in the extant text, apart from the witness list, shows any sign of deriving from an authentic charter of the mid eighth century.

The only other charters in which 'Cearn' appears are two spurious confirmatory Winchester texts relating to Taunton (S443, 825. There are several other very dubious charters relating to Taunton). Withiel Florey appears in one of these, but is also the subject of two tenth-century grants to laymen, one by Eadwign dated 956 which survives in the Winchester cartulary, and one by Eadgar dated 961, extant in the Winchester cartulary and on a contemporary single sheet (S443; S596, 697). In both cases the amount of land granted is 4 hides, and the bounds, although not identical with those in the charter in Æthilheard's name, show that the same area is meant. These two charters indicate that Withiel Florey existed as an independent unit, not attached to 'Cearn' or Taunton, in the tenth century, and was then in royal or lay hands. This does not absolutely disprove the alleged eighth-century grant to Winchester, but certainly lends it no support. The conclusion in this case can only be the same as that suggested above in connection with the charters in the names of Coenwalh and Ine: the surviving text appears to be a fabrication, probably of the tenth century; the witness list is probably basically authentic, but nothing is now known of the charter to which it originally belonged.

* * * * *

S259 and S258

B.L. Additional 15350, fos. 113r and 33rv.

(Editions: B180, 179)

Two charters in the name of Cuthred dated 749 and recording grants

of land to the church at Winchester are virtually identical in wording. The only significant difference between them is in their accounts of the estates. One grants 7 hides at 'Thruhham' (S259) and the other 10 hides at Highclere; in the latter case a set of Old English bounds is added. Dr. C.R. Hart judges that the Thruhham charter is authentic, and that the Highclere charter is spurious, produced by copying the text of the Thruhham charter at a later date (Hart 1970, p. 13). It will be argued below that this view is correct.

There is no good reason to doubt that the wording shared by the two charters is that of a genuine, eighth-century document. Nothing in it can definitely be condemned as an anachronism, and several of the phrases are also found in other charters of the time. The invocation is of the ablative absolute type, 'Regnante ... deo'. This was never as common in early charters as the various forms beginning 'In nomine ...', but there are instances in charters of Cyniwulf and Beorhtric (S263, 265, 267, 269). The phrase 'terra iuris mei', more common at a much later date, also occurs in charters of the preceding reigns (S265, 269). The emphasis on witnesses is paralleled in other charters of the mid eighth century, and in particular some texts contain wordings resembling 'testes idoneos et adstipulatores' (S244, 253, 267, 1410). Similar subscription forms are used by Cyniwulf of Wessex and Æthilbald of Mercia (S96, 262, 263).

The dispositio is unusual in that the word familiae is used to mean hides and that the grant is made to an institution, the church at Winchester, and not to a person or persons: land is given (in the Thruhham charter) 'iuxta mensuram scilicet . vii . familiarum ecclesie dei Petro et Paulo dicte ciuitate Wentana'. It is possible to put forward some defense of both these features. Familiae was regularly used in this sense by Bede, writing c. 731, so there is no real reason why the author of a charter, writing c. 749, should not have employed

it, especially as he may have read the Historia Ecclesiastica. But the word is not used to mean hides in any other charter except in a single instance noticed by Finberg, a Sherborne charter in the name of Æthelstan which is itself probably spurious (ECW, pp. 217-8 and n. 1. The Sherborne charter is S423, ECW, no. 579). Charters expressed as grants to churches rather than to their personnel are not unknown. Bishop Eorcenwald's grant to his sister's church at Barking is a seventh-century example; Cyniwulf made a grant to the church at Sherborne; and more than one South Saxon charter of the eighth century is expressed as a grant to the church at Selsey (S1248, 263). But it is far more usual to find that charters record gifts to an abbot and/or his community, and in the mid eighth century the word familia was often used of a religious community which was the beneficiary of a charter. It is not impossible that the text of the dispositio in these two Winchester charters is both authentic and accurately preserved. But it is perhaps more likely that the received text is corrupt, that the author intended to use some more usual word for hides, such as manentes or cassati and to represent the grant as made to the familia of the church at Winchester, and hence that the text should read, say 'iuxta mensuram scilicet . vii . manentium familie ecclesie dei'. The extant text could have been produced if one word were accidentally omitted, either originally or by a copyist, and the word familie subsequently adjusted by a copyist who either misunderstood the text or consciously emended it. In the Thruhham charter another word is also used for hides, mansae. This is odd in a charter of this date, but is insufficient to condemn the charter in the absence of other suspicious features. Possibly the word has been carelessly substituted for another by a copyist, or it may be an erroneous expansion of some such abbreviation as man for manentes.

The sanction consists only of a prohibitive clause and may have

been abbreviated by a copyist. The prohibitive clause, directed against the donor's successors, is itself an unusual feature in a West Saxon charter of the eighth century, and tends to suggest that the diplomatic of Winchester had affinities with that of the south-east, such parallels as there are occurring in charters of Sussex and Kent (S27, 46; also S50 where a penal clause is directed against the donor's successors. See also under S235 above). The date is expressed solely as an incarnational year, which again suggests abbreviation of the text, and makes it impossible to verify the accuracy of the date given.

The witness list in the Highclere charter consists of six names, of which only three appear in the Thruhham version, but it seems clear that there is only a single list which has been abbreviated more drastically in one instance than in the other. King Cuthred's attestation is followed by that of Hunfrith, bishop of Winchester, who succeeded to the see on Daniel's retirement during the 740s and whose death is recorded in 756 (ASC s.a. 744, 756). The two abbots, Æthilbald and Cynibald, are otherwise unrecorded, as is the ealdorman Æthilfrith. Cynric, described as 'nobiles prosapie' is probably to be identified with the Cynric, 'Westsexna æþeling', who was killed, according to the Chronicle in 748 (ASC s.a. 748). The name is not common, and it presents no particular problem that the date of the charter or the annal needs adjustment, since there is no reason to have implicit faith in the accuracy of either. The cartularist has preserved three names in a recognisably early form, 'Æthilheard', 'Cynibald' and 'Ædilfrid', which suggests an exemplar of the eighth century, and there is no reason to doubt the authenticity of the list.

The land granted in the Thruhham charter is said to consist of 7 hides of which 5 are at Thruhham, 1 at Eppelhyrste, and 1 at Hwitanleage. These places were situated some 20 miles south-west of Winchester in

the area which later became the New Forest. The first two names do not survive, but Thruhham was on the coast on the site of the modern Park Farm, Beaulieu, and Eppelhyrste is named in a medieval charter relating to Brockenhurst, about 7 miles from Park Farm. Hwitanleage survives in Whitley Ridge and other minor place-names in the vicinity of Brockenhurst (ECW, no. 6). None of these places occurs in any other pre-Conquest charter, and of the three only Thruhham occurs in Domesday Book. In 1066 it was assessed at a total of 8 hides, of which $2\frac{1}{2}$ were held by the bishop of Winchester and the rest by various laymen (DB Hampshire, pp. NF2.2, 3.7, 6.2, 9.21, 22). By 1086 it had been engulfed by the Forest. There seems to be no reason to doubt that the account in this charter of the lands granted by Cuthred is authentic, and that some, but not all, of the property was later alienated. The Thruhham charter therefore appears to be authentic.

In the other charter the grant is of 10 hides of land 'quam solicole Cleran . nominant', and a set of Old English bounds is included, which enables the estate to be identified as Highclere in Hampshire, some 20 miles north of Winchester (Crawford 1922, pp. 75-6). Boundary clauses in Old English do not occur in charters as early as the reign of Cuthred, nor do eighth-century charters normally refer to estates as 'land which the inhabitants call X'; this was a ninth- and tenth-century habit. These clauses appear to have been borrowed from a charter of Eadred dated 955 which grants 10 hides of land 'quam solicole nominant . Clearan' and includes a boundary clause virtually identical with that in the charter of Cuthred (S565). It appears that the Highclere charter is a fabrication, produced by copying out the authentic charter of Cuthred but substituting details of a different estate borrowed from another text.

Eadred's charter of 955 granted Highclere to bishop Ælfsige

of Winchester and to three heirs of his, the estate then to revert to the monks of Winchester. Bishop Ælfsige's will accordingly provided for the inheritance of this estate by three members of his family (S1491). But in 959, the year after the bishop's death, Eadgar granted the estate to a layman, evidently disregarding the claims of both Ælfsige's kin and the monks of Winchester (S680). It is noticeable that a new set of bounds was drawn up on this occasion: the same area is enclosed, but evidently the author of this charter did not have access to Winchester's documentation. Winchester ultimately recovered the estate and it was held by the monks in 1066 (DB Hampshire, p. 3.7). It was probably in connection with their efforts to recover it some time between 959 and 1066 that spurious title-deeds for Highclere was produced: the grant in Cuthred's name; a confirmatory charter dated to the early tenth century; and also probably the restoration charter in the name of Eadgar (S383, 819).

* * * * *

S1263

B.L. Additional 15350, fo. 58r.

(Edition: B324)

A brief and rather unusual charter records an exchange of lands between bishop Ealhmund of Winchester and a layman named Berthelm. The surviving text has no proem, sanction, date or witness list, and may well have been abbreviated. It can be dated only to the episcopate of Ealhmund, which itself cannot be dated very closely. Ealhmund appears in charters only during the period 803 to 805 (S1260; B310, 312; S40, 41, 161), but may have held the see some years longer than this: the latest attestations of his predecessor, Cyniberht, occur in 801 (S268, 270a),

and his successor, Wigthehn, first appears in 811 (S167, Winchcombe's foundation charter, which is dubious in details but of which it can at least be said that its witness list seems to belong to its date. Wigthehn's next attestation occurs in a charter of 814 extant in contemporary form, S173). The charter can therefore only be dated 801 x 811 (Finberg (ECW, no. 197) and Sawyer (S1263) date it 801 x 805, on what evidence is unclear).

Bishop Ealhmund granted to Berhthelm 60 hides at Farnham, presumably the same area of land which Ceadwalla granted for the foundation of a monastery in 688. He received in exchange 33 hides in four places, 'id est . Wdutun . Mildanhald . Forscan feld . Bedewinde'. 'Mildanhald' is identified as Mildenhall, Wiltshire, which does not appear in any other extant pre-Conquest charter, but was granted by king Cyniwulf to the layman Bica in a charter now lost (S1682). The name 'Bedewinde' is used in pre-Conquest sources for both Great Bedwyn and Little Bedwyn, both situated only a few miles from Mildenhall; but it seems likely that Little Bedwyn is meant here because this estate was also granted by Cyniwulf to Bica (S264). Mildenhall and Little Bedwyn were therefore both in the possession of Bica in the late eighth century, and it seems likely that the 'Mildanhald' and 'Bedewinde' which were in the possession of Berhthelm at the beginning of the ninth century were the same estates. Berhthelm was probably a relative and heir of Bica. A number of places on the modern map bear the name Wootton which derives from the Old English 'Wdutun', but this one is probably Wootton Rivers in Wiltshire, a few miles away from Mildenhall and Little Bedwyn, and similarly 'Forscan feld' is probably to be identified with the Wiltshire Froxfield, which is in the same area, and not with the Hampshire Froxfield. Neither Wootton Rivers nor Froxfield occurs in any other pre-Conquest charter. None of these four places is connected

with Winchester in any other record, and none was owned by the bishop in 1066. This establishes a strong presumption of the authenticity of bishop Ealhmund's charter, since there was no motive for its forgery.

It appears that Winchester did not intend to lose sight of the estate at Farnham. Winchester received from Berthelm land totalling 33 hides but handed over 60 hides. Of these 60, says the text, 24 are extra. Presumably this figure should be 27, and xxiii is a miscopying of xxvii. From this part of the land the bishop reserves the right to certain dues, produce and maintenance for two nights and ten jars of honey every year. Moreover, all the lands mentioned in the charter are to remain subject to Winchester, 'Possessio uero amborum ... nobis subiugantur'. And if Berthelm or any of his heirs decides to sell Farnham, notice of this is to be given first to the bishop of Winchester who will release 60 hides for a suitable payment, the remaining 20 to be given back without payment, 'ab eo . lx . manentes digno pretio placabili soluantur ceteri . xx . Insoluti sine pretio raddantur'. Again the figures do not make sense, and lx is perhaps a miscopying of xl, the intention being to provide that all 60 hides will revert to Winchester, but that payment will be made for only 40 of them. Farnham did revert to Winchester, and was in the possession of the see in 858 when bishop Swithun leased it to king Æthelbald (S1274).

There are few resemblances between the wording of this charter and those of other charters of the time, but this seems to be only because the content of the text is so unusual and so many of the standard clauses are missing. Nothing in the wording appears anachronistic, and there is no trace of the tenth-century usages which commonly betray Winchester forgeries. It is odd that the church at Winchester is described as dedicated to St. Peter instead of to St. Peter and St. Paul, but possibly the other name has been accidentally omitted by a copyist. There seems to be no good reason to doubt that the charter is genuine. It is of interest in that it provides more details of the terms of the contract than are usually mentioned in a charter. Considered in conjunction with other evidence, it also enables the history of the estates at Farnham, Mildenhall and Little Bedwyn to be traced over a period of years.

* * * * *

Charters of Ecgberht: Introduction

The study of Kentish and Mercian charters of the first half of the ninth century is rendered comparatively easy and fruitful by what may be termed, in the context of early Anglo-Saxon charter studies, an abundance of surviving material which, moreover, includes a fair proportion of contemporary manuscripts. Unfortunately the situation is quite different with regard to West Saxon charters in the same period. The charters of Ecgberht, king of the West Saxons 802-839, are at least as difficult to assess as those of any of his predecessors because of the dearth of extant material. Sawyer lists 14 charters in the name of Ecgberht, and the agreement between the West Saxon kings and the archbishop of Canterbury in 838 may be counted as a

fifteenth charter of the reign (S271-284; S1438); the charter of bishop Ealhmund discussed above, which dates from either the last two years of Beorhtric's reign or the first years of Ecgberht's, is the only other extant West Saxon charter of the period.

Of these 16 charters, 5 relate to Kentish estates (or in some cases privileges) and Kentish beneficiaries (S271, 279, 280, 282, 1438); they were apparently drafted in Kent and, where genuine, show the characteristic Kentish diplomatic of the period, so that their utility for purposes of comparison with purely West Saxon documents is strictly limited. Only two of the remaining 11 charters do not survive at Winchester, and of these one is unusual in content, being a confirmation and not a grant, while the other is probably a fabrication (S277; S278). There is therefore no yardstick by which the Winchester charters might be judged.

All surviving charters of Ecgberht are dated to the period 823-839, so that there is a gap of nearly a quarter of a century between the earliest of these and the latest charters of Beorhtric's reign. Bishop Ealhmund's charter, brief, atypical, and lacking in so many standard clauses, does little to bridge this gap, and, since nothing is known of the development of West Saxon diplomatic during the first half of Ecgberht's reign, it is difficult to know what to expect in the charters of the second half. Comparison with charters of the reign of Æthelwulf is sometimes helpful, but seldom conclusive, since more than a third of the extant charters of Æthelwulf, and all but one of those that survive in contemporary form, are effectively Kentish documents, and much of the material is dubious. In view of these difficulties, the conclusions offered below concerning the block of 8 charters in the name of Ecgberht which survive in the Winchester cartulary should be considered only as tentative.

There is a considerable amount of duplication in the wordings and content of these 8 charters. This can be shown most clearly in tabular form. The first table below shows the witnesses of the 8 documents.

S	283.	273	272	275	274	276	284	281
Ecgerht	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Æthelwulf								x
Wigthehn ^a	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Herefrith ^a			x	x	x	x	x	
Eadhun ^a								x
Ealhstan ^b	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Berthelm	x							
Hiotomann	x							
Witheard		x						
Burhheard	x	x	xx	x	x	x	x	
Wulfheard	x		x	x	x	x	x	
Hun	x		x	x	x	x	x	
Monnede		x	x	x	x	x	x	
Wehhelm			x	x	x	x	x	
List from S446						x		
Ceolnoth, etc.								x
Synod of 839								x

Notes

1. a - bishop of Winchester; b - bishop of Sherborne.
2. Witheard in S273 is probably a miscopying of Wulfheard.
3. The duplication of Burhheard in S272 is probably accidental.

The witness list of S283 appears to be independent, as does that of S281. S273 may represent an independent list, or this might be an abbreviated version of the list which appears in the other five texts. The 8 charters therefore share no more than four witness lists.

A similar conclusion emerges if the dating clauses are compared.

S	283	273		272			275	274	276	281	
		(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)	(3)				(1)	(2)
Place	Ac1	Cre	Omt	Cre	Omt		Omt		Omt	Cin	Uet
AD	924	825		825		826	826	826	826	838	839
Indiction	2	3		3		4	4	4	4		
Regnal year	23					24	24	10	24		1 Æ
Month		Aug	Dec	Aug	Dec						
Day		19	26	19	26						
Feast day					Ste phen						
'Ducatus'						14	14		14		

Notes

1. S284 has no dating clause and is therefore omitted from this table.
2. The abbreviated place-names are:-
 - Ac1 - 'Ac leah'
 - Cre - 'Creodantreow'
 - Omt - 'Omtune'
 - Cin - 'Cingestun'
 - Uet - 'Uetustissimus', recte 'æt Astran'.

S283 is independent, as is S281. A third dating clause, the two-part clause involving both August and December 825, appears in S273 and S272. The other three texts appear to share the same dating clause,

which is also duplicated in S272. The obscure 14th 'ducatus' mentioned in three of these clauses is perhaps connected with the erroneous regnal year in the fourth. Quite what the author had in mind is not clear, but it can scarcely be a coincidence that $24 - 14 = 10$. It therefore appears that the 8 charters contain only four lots of dating information.

The rest of the wording in some of these charters duplicates in whole or in part wordings found in other texts.

S	283	273	272	275	274	276	284	281
Wording // in S	-	272/6	273/6	229	-	272/3	242	1438

The texts of S275 and S284 are spurious, apparently drawn up in the tenth century, and S273 and S276 share the same wording, which is also the basis of S272, so that there are only four possibly authentic wordings among the 8 charters.

The evidence of these various duplications establishes at least an a priori assumption that not all the extant charters in Ecgberht's name are authentic, and suggests that some of them are fabrications produced by borrowing clauses from other charters. Two of them may, indeed, be summarily dismissed. S275 consists of the wordings of the spurious Downton charter in the name of Coenwalh discussed above, varied only by the use of Ecgberht's name and a reference to the earlier grant of Coenwalh, plus a dating clause and witness list which occur in other charters as detailed above. The text was apparently drafted in the tenth century and is full of words and clauses anachronistic in a document of supposedly early ninth-century date. The dating clause and witness list have presumably been borrowed from another

charter and introduced here in order to date the text to Ecgberht's reign. In the same way S284 duplicates the wording of the spurious grant of Alresford in Ine's name and includes the same witnesses as S275 and other charters. This text too appears to have been written in the tenth century. These two charters seem to be fabrications. The other charters in Ecgberht's name are discussed individually below.

* * * * *

S283

B.L. Additional 15350, fos. 39v-40r.

(Edition: B377)

On the evidence of the information tabulated above, this charter seems the one most likely to be genuine since its wording, dating clause and witness list are all independent. Moreover, it is the only one of the 8 charters which is not a grant to Winchester: this is a grant to the layman Wulfheard, and this circumstance establishes a presumption of the basic authenticity of the text since there is no motive for forgery.

Much of the document appears to be authentic. Only a single phrase in the dispositio, 'largiflua dei et dapsili manu', is suspect, resembling tenth-century phraseology; the rest of the clause seems to be genuine. The king's title is normal for this time, 'Occidentalium Saxonum rex'; the beneficiary is described as Ecgberht's prefectus, a title commonly applied to eighth- and ninth-century ealdormen; the estate has no name of its own but is said to be adjacent to, and on either side of, the river 'Meone', now the Meon in Hampshire; and the references to local inhabitants, 'ubi incole appellant Meone', 'iuxta estimationem incolarum in modum xxiiorum manentium', are acceptable

in a ninth-century charter (Cf. S292: 'ubi ruricoli appellant Lottisham')
The rest of the clause consists of formulas common in early charters.

There is no immunity or sanction, which perhaps indicates some abbreviation by a copyist. The document is dated from 'ac leah', but it is impossible to be certain which Oakley is meant. The date is given as 924, the second indiction, the 23rd year of Ecgberht's reign. The incarnational year is presumably a slip of the pen and should be 824 which fits the other details. Regnal years are commonly stated in early ninth-century charters (Eg. S161, 163, 188, 1438).

The witnesses are the king, the two West Saxon bishops and five laymen who are all given the title prefectus and were doubtless ealdormen. The bishops are Wigthehn, described as 'episcopus ciuitate Wentane', and Ealhstan, 'electus in episcopatum Scireburnensis'. Wigthehn had succeeded Ealhmund probably by 811 and certainly by 814, and his death is entered in the Chronicle under 836 (S167, 173; ASC s.a. 836). The Chronicle also states that bishop Ealhstan died in 867 after an episcopate of 50 years, which contradicts the information of this charter. It may be that the attestations of the bishops in this charter have been elaborated by a later writer, since it was not usual, although not without parallel (The one undoubted parallel is the remarkable synodal witness list of 803: B312), for sees to be specified. But even if this has been done, it seems unlikely that 'electus in episcopatum' has been substituted merely as a variant for 'episcopus', since the person responsible could scarcely be unaware that the meaning was thereby altered. The phrase therefore seems likely to be genuine. Moreover, it is noticeable that there was no bishop of Sherborne at the Council of Clofesho on the 30th October 824 (S1433, 1434): possibly this date fell between the death of bishop Wigberht and the consecration of Ealhstan. It is not impossible that the charter is at fault, but

the probability seems to be that Ealhstan was elected in 824 and died c. 867 after an episcopate of about 43 years, the Chronicle's round number of years being an inaccuracy although based on a genuinely long episcopate.

The first lay witness is Berhthelm, who is presumably to be identified with the man who exchanged lands with bishop Ealhmund several years earlier. Burhheard is known only from his attestations of 7 of the 8 Winchester charters of Ecgberht. Wulfheard, the beneficiary of this grant, was one of the men sent by Ecgberht to conquer Kent in the following year, and died in 840 after enjoying a victory against the Vikings at Southampton - which may indicate that he was ealdorman of Hampshire; he attests several charters of Ecgberht extant at Winchester and elsewhere, and was with Æthelwulf at Wilton after Ecgberht's death in 839 (ASC s.a. 825, 840; for Winchester charters see the table in the text; also S270, 271, 278, 280 (not all of which are authentic); and S1438). Hun is known only from his attestations of several of the Winchester charters of Ecgberht. Hiotomann is otherwise unknown. The last of these names would not have been known to a forger, and the borrowing of Berhthelm's name from bishop Ealhmund's (undated) charter seems unlikely. The whole witness list appears to be genuine, as does much of the text of the charter. There has however, been some interpolation. The proem otherwise occurs only in charters of the tenth century (S450, 502, 530, 559, 604, 668), and the long Old English boundary clause is described by Whitelock as certainly of later date (S283).

The estate consists of 22 hides on either side of the river Meon. According to Grundy, the bounds indicate that the area comprised portions of the modern parishes of Privett, Froxfield and East Meon (Grundy 1926, p. 195). A number of other charters relate to Meon or the river Meon, but none includes the same hidage or bounds or relates to quite

the same area (S269, 417, 619, 754, 811; on the boundaries and the problems they present see Grundy 1926, pp. 192-230), so that it is impossible to trace the history of this estate. In 1066 East Meon was an extensive manor of 72 hides, but of this area Winchester held only 6 hides and 1 virgate; the bishop also held 20 hides at West Meon (DB Hampshire, pp. 1.16, 2.13, 2.11). Motive for forgery of this charter cannot be demonstrated, but the estate presumably existed as a unit when the boundary clause was written (or modernised), perhaps in the tenth century. The charter was probably written out in its extant form at that time. Use was evidently made of an authentic charter of Ecgberht, and there is no reason to doubt that this was a grant of land to ealdorman Wulfheard. But it is impossible to be certain that that charter originally related to the estate on the river Meon, given the undoubted evidence of other texts that the Winchester community made a practice of combining genuine charter wordings with details of estates for which they wanted title deeds.

* * * * *

S273

B.L. Additional 15350, fos. 91v-92r.

(Edition: B389)

This charter records a grant by Ecgberht to the monastery of St. Peter and St. Paul of 5 hides at Worthy in Hampshire. A glance at the tables above will show that the bulk of the text of this charter is duplicated in another of the Winchester charters in Ecgberht's name, while the dating clause recurs in a third. The document which shares the wording shares its witness list and dating clause with other charters and appears to contain little that could be independent; the one which

shares the date also duplicates another dating clause found in other texts, and has therefore clearly been tampered with. The witness list of the Worthy charter has some appearance of independence. These factors tend to suggest that this charter may be basically independent, the duplications elsewhere representing borrowings from this document.

The text begins with a very common invocation of ancient origin, and there is no proem. A substantial section of the dispositio is duplicated in a charter of Beorhtric:-

S273: 'Ego Ecgberhtus regali fretus dignitate de terra quam precessores mei atque propinqui iure michi hereditario possidendam reliquerunt . aliquam portionem terre monasterio sanctorum apostolorum Petri et Pauli pro remedio anime mee perpetualiter impendere largitus sum .'

S269: 'ego Beorhtricus regali fretus dignitate de terra iuris mei quam predecessores mei atque propinqui michi iure hereditario possidendam reliquerunt aliquam portionem Hemele fidelissimo principi meo sempiternaliter possidendam largitus sum'.

This wording has some appearance of having been borrowed by the author of the charter of Ecgberht, whose introduction of the superfluous word 'terre' after 'aliquam portionem' suggests that he did not fully understand the sentence he was transcribing. But it is impossible to be certain whether this borrowing was the work of a ninth-century author of a genuine charter of Ecgberht using a slightly earlier charter for guidance, or that of a forger of much later date. Beorhtric's charter now survives in the Abingdon cartulary, but relates to land in Hampshire and involves a lay beneficiary, so it could well have been written originally in the scriptorium at Winchester, or perhaps deposited there by a lay owner for safe-keeping before being moved to Abingdon. Or there might have been another, similar charter of Beorhtric at Winchester. The evidence is inconclusive.

There are, however, some grounds for arguing that the wording of the charter of Ecgberht is genuine. The dispositio continues,

after the wording quoted above, with a list of the components of the property in fairly normal terms, and refers to 'antiquitatis statuta ad eam pertinentibus', which recalls a phrase in the apparently authentic charter of Ecgberht now extant in the cartulary of Shaftesbury, 'iuxta antiquam conscriptionem' (S277). There follows an immunity whose content and wording have some parallel in charters of the time. The introductory phrase 'augere amplificarique elemosinam' resembles the wording of the immunity in one of Beorhtric's charters, 'ad augmentum hujus Donationis et ad Eleemosynam animae meae' (S267). The immunity is granted 'excepto expeditione et pontis factione', and another charter of Beorhtric has the same two exceptions expressed in the same words, 'extra expeditione et pontis factione', while a charter of Æthelwulf which is extant in contemporary form and therefore of unquestionable authenticity contains an immunity with the same two exceptions (S268, 298; Brooks 197, p. 81). The last phrase, 'quod omni plebi commune est' is of a type not uncommon in Mercian and West Saxon charters of this period, for example 'quod omni populo necesse est' in a charter of Offa, and 'quod omni populo communis est' in one of Æthelwulf (S139, 292).

The Old English boundary clause which follows the immunity is the single feature of this document which can scarcely be genuine in a charter of this date. It has presumably been added later, or may represent a modernised version of an authentic, early ninth-century boundary clause. Its presence does not, of course, prejudice the possible authenticity of the charter, since Old English bounds were commonly added to genuine early charters which lacked them. And the fact that this is the single feature of this text which could not be genuine is a not inconsiderable argument in favour of the authenticity of the document, since a forger of later date is not likely to have been able to save himself so entirely from anachronism. The blessing and sanction are

unobjectionable and end with the qualification 'nisi satisfactione ante emendauerit', which is unparalleled in earlier authentic West Saxon charters but is normal in later ones, and occurs often enough in Kentish and Mercian charters from the late eighth century onwards (Eg. S40, 149; B312) to encourage the supposition that it is genuine here.

There follows a very remarkable dating clause which states that the first draft of this charter was made during military service when Ecgberht, 'rex Geuuissorum' moved against the Britons at a place called 'Creodantreop' (i.e. Creoda's tree, unidentified) on the 19th August 825, the 3rd indiction, in the presence of witnesses whose names are written 'in fronte huius cartule'; the charter was then written at 'Omtune', that is Southampton, on the 26th December. Invention of all this detail is most improbable, and nothing in the clause suggests forgery: 'rex Geuuissorum', as mentioned elsewhere, was a title occasionally used in genuine West Saxon charters; 'Creodantreop' is not otherwise recorded, and the name would probably not have been available to a forger; the indications of date are consistent with each other and with the witnesses, and the reference to the names of the witnesses appearing on the front of the charter can only indicate that the author was writing on a single sheet, this clause evidently being placed on the verso. The information of this clause does not coincide with (and could not have been borrowed from) that of the Chronicle for the year 825 - misdated 823 in all surviving manuscripts. The Chronicle reports that there was a battle between the Britons and the men of Devon at 'Gafolforda', now Galford in Devon; that Ecgberht defeated Beornwulf of Mercia at 'Ellendune' on the site of the modern town of Wroughton in Wiltshire; and that Ecgberht sent Æthelwulf and other West Saxon leaders to Kent where they drove out king Bealdred and conquered the south-east. It is not certain that Whitelock was correct in regarding the details in

this charter as relating to the Galford campaign (See S273 and her footnote to the Chronicle's annal, EHD, p. 185 n. 4). If Ecgberht fought that battle it is odd that the Chronicle does not say so, and odd that his army consisted only of the men of Devon. It would be more natural to interpret the Chronicle's account as indicating that the men of Devon were led by their ealdorman, in which case the information of the charter relates to a separate campaign. This is not implausible. The outcome of the battle of Galford is not stated. If it were a West Saxon defeat, the resulting situation on the south-western border may well have been critical, necessitating a further campaign led by Ecgberht himself.

The witness list consists of the king, bishops Wigthegn of Winchester and Ealhstan of Sherborne, and three ealdormen, Monnede, Burhheard and 'Witheard', the last probably being a miscopying of Wulfheard. As the table above shows, all these men appear in a witness list appended to five other charters, but the omission of some other names from that list and the miscopying of one name, which does not occur elsewhere, suggest that this list may be independent. There is no objection to any of the names which it contains. Monnede, the only witness who does not also attest the Meon charter discussed above, appears also in a witness list which seems to be genuine although appended to a dubious charter of Ecgberht in the Textus Roffensis, and he was at Wilton with Æthelwulf in 839 (S271, 1438). Bishop Ealhstan and ealdorman Wulfheard were among the leaders of the expedition to Kent in 825, which cannot therefore have occurred at the same time as the British campaign. It may be that the annexation of Kent did not occur in 825 at all. Roger of Wendover, whose chronology of the events of Ecgberht's reign differs from that of the Chronicle and may be derived from another (possibly Mercian) source, dates it to 827 (Coxe, Roger of Wendover, s.a. 827). The evidence of this charter cannot be said to afford any grounds for

deciding between the two dates.

The estate which is the subject of this charter is identified by Grundy as Martyr Worthy some 3 miles from Winchester (Grundy 1926, p. 182). Two later charters both surviving in the Winchester cartulary and both rather dubious, record grants of land or privileges at Martyr Worthy to laymen, but in neither case does the hidage or boundary clause agree with those in the charter of Ecgberht, the estates being of 3 and 8 hides respectively (S304, 351). In 1066 Winchester owned Martyr Worthy which was then assessed at 3 hides (DB Hampshire, p. 3.13).

It is a point in favour of this charter that its information about the estate differs from what appears in later documentation and hence, presumably, from what a forger would have written.

The probability seems to be that this charter is substantially genuine, possibly altered only by the addition or perhaps the modernisation, of the boundary clause. But, in view of the extensive rewriting of the charters in Ecgberht's name in this cartulary, the possibility that this charter was originally a grant to some other beneficiary, or related to some other estate, cannot be ruled out. It does, however, seem very likely that the dating clause should be accepted as part of an authentic text of 825, and valid historical evidence for the reign of Ecgberht.

* * * * *

S272

B.L. Additional 15350, fos. 75v-76v.

(Edition: B390)

This charter, which purports to record a grant of land at Alton Priors in Wiltshire to Winchester does not appear to have any authentic basis, and is probably a fabrication produced largely by borrowing

clauses from other documents.

The text begins with a lengthy proem which has no close parallel among extant charters but has every appearance of being a production of the tenth century. The document then incorporates virtually the whole wording of the dispositio, immunity, sanction and dating clause from the Worthy charter discussed above into a much longer and more complex text in which every clause is elaborated and which is anachronistic both in its phraseology and in its repeated references to the 'uetus monasterium', a name which the establishment did not acquire until the foundation of New Minster in the early tenth century. A further dating clause is added, contradicting the first, this being the clause which also occurs in three other charters in Ecgberht's name, while the witness list which follows appears also in the same three charters and in a fourth (see tables above). The only portions of this text which could be genuine ninth-century work are all duplicated in other Winchester charters of Ecgberht, while the portions which are independent appear to have been drafted not earlier than the tenth century, and the allusions to the Old Minster establish with absolute certainty that the charter did not acquire its present form before the tenth century.

The second dating clause states that the transaction was concluded in 826, the 4th indiction, the 24th year of Ecgberht's reign, and the 14th of his 'ducatus'. The first three of these indications are consistent; the meaning of the last is obscure, as is discussed above, and should probably be interpreted as an elaboration added to a clause probably genuine in itself and originally forming part of an authentic charter. A similar conclusion is suggested by the witness list. The name of Ecgberht is followed by those of three bishops, Wigthehn of Winchester, Ealhstan of Sherborne, and Herefrith, also of Winchester. The information of this list that two bishops of Winchester were active at the same

time is not without some degree of corroboration in other sources. According to the Chronicle, bishops Wigthegn and Herefrith both died in 836, and Herefrith's profession of faith was addressed to archbishop Wulfred who died in 832 (Richter 1973, no. 14); if these two sources are accurate and reliable, there were two bishops for at least four years. There is no other charter evidence for the situation: Herefrith appears only in the Winchester charters which include this witness list, and Wigthegn attests no reliable charter later than 826. The remainder of the list consists of six laymen. Burhheard, Wulfheard, Hun and Monnede are discussed in connection with other witness lists above. A second man named Burhheard is probably not another individual but simply the accidental repetition of the same name. The last witness, ealdorman Wehhelm, is known only from the copies of this list. There seems no good reason to doubt that the list was originally appended to a genuine charter of the latter part of Ecgberht's reign, probably between 824 (the probable date of Ealhstan's election) and 832 (the latest possible date for Herefrith's consecration). It may well be that the dating clause and witness list originated in the same document.

One circumstance mentioned in the dispositio of this charter may have some basis in fact. This is an earlier grant of the estate by Ecgberht to the prefect Burhheard, upon whose death without issue the leading men in Wessex judged that the land should revert to Ecgberht. The account of the reversion to Ecgberht seems dubious, but the grant to Burhheard is unlikely to have been invented, indeed the whole account reads like the attempt of an over-anxious forger to reconcile an actual grant to Burhheard with the grant to Winchester which he wished to establish. There are no grounds for arguing that any of the text of Ecgberht's charter to Burhheard survives in the extant document, and the appearance of Burhheard, alive and well, in the witness list

only serves to confirm that this charter is a patchwork incorporating clauses from various documents.

The estate which is the subject of this charter consists of 15 hides at 'Æpeltune', now Alton Priors in Wiltshire. It is mentioned in only two other pre-Conquest documents, and these are both preserved in the Codex Wintoniensis immediately after this charter. The first, which is added virtually as an endorsement to the charter in Ecgberht's name, is an Old English document of the eleventh century and records that bishop Stigand and his community at Old Minster leased two hides at Alton Priors and a small amount of land elsewhere to Wulfric for two lives (Sl403). Motive for forgery of such a document is lacking, and it is probably genuine, although Domesday Book does not mention Wulfric's interest, listing Alton Priors, assessed at 20 hides in 1066, as the property of the bishop of Winchester (DB Wiltshire, p. 2.4). The other pre-Conquest document, also probably genuine, is the will of Ceolwyn, widow of Osmod, recording her bequest of 15 hides at Alton Priors, formerly owned by her husband, to the church at Winchester (Sl513). The estate is detailed in a lengthy Old English boundary clause identical to that incorporated into the charter of Ecgberht. The probability seems to be that Winchester acquired Alton Priors by Ceolwyn's bequest, and perhaps at the same time acquired the title deed for the property which was a grant by Ecgberht to the ealdorman Burhheard, from whom the estate had presumably passed by sale or inheritance to Osmod. The community later fabricated the charter of Ecgberht by combining the details of the land from Ceolwyn's will with clauses from other charters, elaborated to produce the inflated style admired in the tenth century, and a reference designed to reconcile this document with the grant to Burhheard. The statement of that grant seems to be the only piece of genuine information peculiar to this charter.

Some of the clauses incorporated into it probably originally formed part of genuine charters of Ecgberht's reign, but this document seems to be a fabrication.

* * * * *

S274

B.L. Additional 15350, fo. 62 rv.

(Edition: B392)

This charter records Ecgberht's grant to Winchester of an estate at Calbourne on the Isle of Wight. Its wording is singular and not readily identifiable as the style of any particular period, but it is difficult to believe in it as an authentic text of the early ninth century. The grant is said to be made for the sake, inter alia, of the relief of the king's soul and the souls of all Christian Kings of the race of the Angles ('gentis Anglorum') who lived before him, and of those who are to live after him. Use of the word Angli in an early ninth-century charter could only imply that the intention was to include earlier kings of all Anglo-Saxon kingdoms. This is scarcely probable, and the passage is much more likely to have been drafted in the days when there was a king of the English who could look back to earlier kings of the English, i.e. not earlier than the tenth century. The sanction immediately follows the dispositio and consists of a prohibitive clause and penal clause, both worded with unusual emphasis. There is also a blessing but this is separated from the sanction by an immunity without exceptions which states that the land is to be subject to no-one but the bishop of Winchester. This is the third time Winchester is named in the document. There is a fairly brief Old English boundary clause, and a dating clause

which agrees with those in three other Winchester charters in its references to 826 and the 3rd indiction, but includes no 'ducatus' and wrongly cites Ecgberht's regnal year as the 10th. As mentioned above, the 'ducatus' may represent an attempt to reconcile this error with more accurate information about Ecgberht's reign. Conversely, this error may derive from an attempt to explain the 'ducatus'. The probability seems to be that the dating clause is genuine, although corrupt in its extant forms. The witness list is the same as that in the charter just discussed (S272), except that there is no repetition of Burhheard's name here, and Ealhstan is misrepresented as a layman.

Calbourne is not mentioned in any other pre-Conquest charter, but the boundary clause which appears in this document is also transcribed on the preceding folio of the cartulary where the land is said to belong to the estate of Downton in Wiltshire (S1581). In 1066 Calbourne was the only manor on the Isle of Wight owned by the bishop of Winchester (DB Hampshire, p. 10W 2.1). The estate was then of 32 hides, and the area may well have been much the same as that of the 30 hides detailed in this charter.

The unusual nature of the wording, the reference to earlier kings of the Angli and the emphasis on Winchester and on religious sanctions all combine to render this a suspicious document, more likely to be a fabrication of perhaps the tenth century than a genuine ninth-century charter. It may have been fabricated because Winchester owned Calbourne but had no title deed for it. The dating clause and witness list seem basically authentic although somewhat corrupt, but the charter in which they originated may not have been a grant of Calbourne to Winchester.

* * * * *

S276

B.L. Additional 15350, fos. 102v-103r.

(Edition: B393)

This document records a grant by Ecgberht to Winchester of an estate at Droxford in Hampshire. Every part of its wording is duplicated in at least one other Winchester charter. The invocation, dispositio and immunity are virtually identical with those in the Martyr Worthy charter (S273), the only significant difference being the substitution of a different estate. The same text forms the basis of the Alton Priors charter (S272), and the sanction here is very close in wording to the sanction of that document. The charter is dated 826 by a clause which occurs in two other charters and in a slightly different form in a third (see table); in this and one other case (S275) an additional detail dates the charter from 'Omtune', which is probably lifted from the 825 dating clause which occurs in two charters (S272, 273). The witness list includes the names which appear in four other Winchester charters (see table), but has been made much more extensive by the inclusion of many names borrowed from the witness list of another charter which is grouped with this one in the cartulary, a grant of Æthelstan to his sister Eadburh in 939 (S446). Æthelstan's charter also relates to Droxford and the Old English bounds in it are identical with those in the charter of Ecgberht, although the hidage is different, 17 hides in Æthelstan's grant, 20 in Ecgberht's. A third Winchester charter relates to Droxford, Eadwig's grant of 956 to Æthelhild (S600). This is also a grant of 20 hides, but the bounds are different from those in the other two charters and are very brief. In 1066 the estate was owned by Winchester and assessed at 16 hides (DB Hampshire. p. 3.9).

The fact that no part of this charter is independent and that it includes undoubted borrowings from a charter of later date relating to the same estate suggest that it is a fabrication produced entirely by taking clauses from other charters. It may be that the community wished to have a direct grant of an estate for which the only genuine documentation consisted of grants to laywomen.

* * * * *

S281

B.L. Additional 15350, fo. 113v.

(Edition: B423)

The last of the 8 charters in the name of Ecgberht records a grant to Winchester of land at Shalfleet on the Isle of Wight and is dated from Kingston, Surrey, in 838. A Canterbury charter which survives in three contemporary manuscripts records that a council attended by archbishop Ceolnoth and numerous bishops and by the West Saxon kings Ecgberht and Æthelwulf and all their leading men, was held at Kingston in 838, and that at this meeting disagreements between the kings and the archiepiscopal see were resolved, peace was restored, and an estate whose ownership had been in question was restored to Christ Church (Sl438). Several clauses in the Winchester charter are almost identical with clauses in the Canterbury text.

The first part of the charter is, however, almost entirely independent. After an invocation of a common type and a brief proem asserting the need for written records, the dispositio states that Ecgberht 'gratia dei Occidentalium Saxonum rex' has granted a portion of land of his own hereditary property in the Isle of Wight, comprising 40 hides 'æt Scealdan Fleote'. The wording is simple and straightforward,

much of it consisting of standard formulas, and containing nothing which could not appear in an authentic ninth-century document, and virtually nothing in common with the Canterbury charter. It should be noted that the dispositio contains no indication that the transaction was anything other than a simple grant, or that any dispute lay behind it: the point is of some significance in assessing the remainder of the text.

The next clause states that the contract is subject to the condition that friendship is henceforth to subsist between Æthelwulf and bishop Eadhun of Winchester and his community. The wording almost exactly duplicates that in the Canterbury charter, the only significant differences being the substitution of 'Æðelpulfus filius meus' for 'nos ipsi nostrique heredes', and of references to Winchester for references to Christ Church. There follows a curious sanction which provides that any act of hostility on the part of any holder of the see of Winchester will result in the cancellation of the grant and restoration of the estate to the West Saxon king. This clause does not closely correspond with anything in the Canterbury charter, but is perhaps connected with a passage in that document which urges that there should be no further disputes and that peace should prevail: the two clauses share a few words and phrases and their inspiration seems to be much the same. Following this sanction is a statement that two copies of the document are to be made, one for the bishop and one for the kings to be kept 'cum hereditatis eorum scripturis'. The wording duplicates the Canterbury wording except for adjustment to make this version apply to the bishop of Winchester instead of the archbishop of Canterbury.

Every word of the Winchester dating clause is duplicated in the Canterbury charter, but the latter includes an indiction and day of the week while the former gives the date only as a year of grace, and the statement dating the charter from Kingston occurs in the Canterbury charter not in the dating clause but in the introductory passage which

gives an account of the council: it is fairly clear that the wording does not represent accidentally identical drafting but has been copied from one document into the other, since both versions include the same grammatical error, 'in illa famosa loco' (This has been first transcribed then corrected by the twelfth-century cartularist).

The Winchester document then contains an item conspicuous by its absence from all manuscripts of the Canterbury charter, this being the Kingston witness list. It consists of the attestations of archbishop Ceolnoth, kings Ecgberht and Æthelwulf and bishops Ealhstan of Sherborne, Beornmod of Rochester, Eadhun of Winchester and Cynered of Selsey. Two further names are added, bishop Helmstan, who was Eadhun's successor at Winchester, and Swithun, described as deacon. These two names evidently represent some tampering with the list at a later date, but it need not be doubted that the list is basically authentic. It is consistent with the Canterbury charter's account of the attendance at the council and with the witness list of the Rochester charter of 838 which probably relates to the same council, or perhaps a meeting of the same assembly on another day (S281). All persons concerned fit the date.

The record of the Canterbury agreement was taken for confirmation to two meetings in 839 after the death of Ecgberht, one a West Saxon assembly at Wilton and the other an episcopal synod at Astra. There is no trace in the Winchester charter of the Wilton endorsement and witness list, but the Astra endorsement is duplicated exactly, except that the indiction is omitted and the place-name is given as 'Uetustissimus', which Birch plausibly explains as an accidental mistranscription of 'æt Astran' by a scribe who misread the open a of a ninth-century exemplar as u (B423, p. 594 n. 2). An abbreviated version of the Astra witness list follows, and here too the name of Swithun has been interpolated into the Winchester version.

If the Winchester charter is considered genuine, the implication must be that after the council of Kingston the same man drew up charters on behalf of the communities of Christ Church and Winchester, and that both charters were later taken to the synod of Astra for confirmation. This seems improbable for various reasons. Firstly such collaboration between two sees is unparalleled and inherently unlikely. Secondly, the duplicated material largely relates to the ending of a dispute and the agreement of future friendship which were the basis of the Christ Church contract: the exhortation to eternal peace and friendship, the prohibition of future disputes and the repeated word reconciliatio suit this context but are wholly inappropriate in the Winchester document which appears to relate to a simple grant of land. Similarly the provision that a copy is to be provided for the West Saxon kings is logical in the Canterbury charter where both sides had something to gain from the agreement, but inappropriate in the Winchester charter. A contemporary writer would scarcely have introduced all these irrelevant provisions into a charter; they are more plausibly explained as the work of a forger of later date who borrowed wordings from the material available to him and did not have so much material of the right date that he could discard what was inappropriate. Thirdly, it seems a coincidence that both documents should have been taken to the synod of Astra for confirmation and there is no apparent reason why confirmation of the straightforward grant recorded in the Winchester charter should have been needed. The word reconciliatio recurs here in Ceolnoth's attestation, implying, if the charter were genuine, that irrelevant material was introduced into the text on another occasion some 12 months after this was first done. It is simpler to assume that all the duplicated material, including this endorsement, was borrowed by one writer who consistently failed to eliminate this word.

A forger at Winchester would not have had access to the Christ Church archive. But the Canterbury text states that a copy of the charter was made for the West Saxon royal archive. That archive was probably kept at a church, just as the Mercian royal archive was housed at Winchcombe (Levison 1946, pp. 249-52), and Winchester is at least as likely a candidate as any other. Moreover, the fact that the original manuscript of Æthelwulf's grant to himself, presumably part of the West Saxon royal archive, was at Winchester in the seventeenth century (Finberg 1969, p. 11; Chaplais 1965, p. 57) lends some support to the theory that the archive was at Winchester in earlier years. There is therefore a distinct possibility that the text of the Canterbury charter was available to a later writer at Winchester, and, moreover, the West Saxon copy of the charter may well have included the Kingston witness list, and therefore have been the source for this as well as for all the duplicated material. On this basis it may be suggested as probable that this document was produced in the same way as several other charters of Ecgberht at Winchester, by transposing sections from a genuine charter into a document which is itself a fabrication (Cf. Brooks 1984, p. 354 n. 59).

Two objections to the theory of fabrication are that there are no anachronisms in the wording except for the names added to the witness lists, and that no motive for forgery can be demonstrated. It is unusual for writers to be wholly successful in avoiding the phraseology of their own times when drawing up charters purporting to be of much earlier date, and the fact that the dispositio of this charter is both independent and wholly unobjectionable in its wording is a point in favour of the charter. The estate at Shalfleet is not mentioned in any other pre-Conquest charter and was not owned by Winchester in 1066 or 1086, so there is no evidence outside this charter that the see ever had an interest in it. This does not, of course, preclude the possibility that

Winchester owned the land at one time but lost it before the Conquest.

It is extremely difficult to judge this charter. On the whole, it seems most likely that it is a fabrication, but this cannot be regarded as anything more than a probability. This is unfortunate because the document would constitute extremely interesting evidence if it were possible to be certain either that it is genuine or that it is fabricated. One clause which should probably be regarded as authentic in either case is the sanction directed against the bishop: this is unlikely to have been invented at Winchester. It was probably written in the ninth century, either as part of a genuine Winchester charter, or as part of the original version of the Christ Church agreement, being toned down by the author of the surviving recensions.

* * * * *

Charters of Ecgberht: Summary

There is clear evidence in the surviving documents for extensive tampering, involving the combining of sections from different sources to create wholly spurious documents, and in particular the interpolation of details of estates borrowed from later documents into wordings originating in early ninth-century charters. Consequently it is impossible to rely upon any of these charters as a document of basic authenticity preserving the record of a genuine transaction; it may be that the transaction is mythical in every single case.

However, it is also fairly clear that elements from genuine charters of Ecgberht's reign are incorporated into these documents. The witness lists can only derive from authentic charters of the reign, and the probability is that those sections of the extant texts which appear to be genuine, ninth-century drafting derive from the same charters

as the witness lists. From the evidence of the surviving charters, the former existence of three authentic instruments of Ecgberht's reign can be postulated:-

1. A grant of Ecgberht to Wulfheard dated 824 whose wording, including the dating clause and witness list, is substantially preserved in S283. The grant may have been of the estate by the river Meon, but this cannot be considered certain. The witness list of this charter should probably be accepted as correcting the Chronicle's dating of the election of Ealhstan, bishop of Sherborne.
2. A charter of 825, much of whose wording is preserved in S273. The transaction recorded is unknown. The witness list provides evidence for an otherwise unrecorded campaign of Ecgberht against the Britons.
3. A grant of Ecgberht to Burhheard, probably of land at Alton Priors, dated 826. The witness list and dating clause preserved in S272 and other extant charters probably belong to this document, but the rest of the wording does not survive.

* * * * *

(c) Lost Charters

Grants of land to Winchester were among the details incorporated into a brief chronicle evidently written at Winchester and known as the Annales Monasterii de Wintonia (Edited by H.R. Luard for the Rolls Series in 1865: Luard, Winchester Annals. The following account of the chronicle, its date and the extant manuscripts is based on the editor's introduction). The chronicle, as preserved in a manuscript of the late thirteenth or early fourteenth century, British Library, Cotton

Domitian A xiii, covers the period 519-1277, but the portion relating to the period down to 1066 is copied with a few additions from a slightly earlier manuscript, Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, 339, and some of the writer's references to his own times suggest that the chronicle may have been first written during the reign of Henry II, the later portion representing a continuation by one or more later writers. The work may therefore date from much the same time as the cartulary.

Grants relating to the period down to 839 mentioned in the Annals are listed in the table on the following page. Where the relevant charters survive, Sawyer's numbers are given. Comparison of this list with the surviving charters shows that the annalist (or his source) disregarded grants to beneficiaries other than Winchester, and also tended to ignore confirmatory charters relating to estates of which he had already recorded the grant (For example, he lists Downton and Alresford as grants of Coenwalh and makes no reference to the extant charters in the name of Ecgberht relating to these estates, S275, 284). He includes a number of grants not mentioned in any extant charter, and therefore clearly had some source other than the Codex Wintoniensis; the source may have been an earlier cartulary, a collection of single sheets, or merely a list of benefactions to Winchester.

It is highly unlikely that any of the listed grants by Coenwalh has any foundation in fact. All the estates concerned were part of Winchester's Domesday endowment and the subject of later charters (DB Hampshire, pp. 3.1, 2.1, 3.13; DB Wiltshire, p. 2.1; Chilcomb, S325, 376, etc.; Downton, S275, 393, etc.; Alresford, S242, 284, etc.; Worthy, S273, 351, etc.), and Coenwalh, recorded by Bede as the first West Saxon king to establish an episcopal see at Winchester (HE III 7), was an obvious choice of donor for Winchester forgers. Only one of the four grants is represented by a surviving charter, and that

is a fabrication. The other statements are probably based on similar spurious documents, or possibly on the references to grants by Coenwalh which are incorporated into dubious later charters relating to all these estates (Chilcomb, S376, 817, 821; Downton, S275; Alresford, S242, 284; Worthy, S309). The alleged grant by Ecgberht of Beddington in Surrey might have taken place; the estate was certainly owned by Winchester at the beginning of the tenth century when bishop Denewulf leased it to king Edward (S1444). But the evidence is far from sufficient to establish such a grant: the annalist's statement may be based on a fabricated or interpolated charter resembling the extant Winchester charters of Ecgberht, or might derive from the reference in a confirmatory charter in the name of Eadgar to grants by earlier kings including Ecgberht (S815).

<u>Annal</u>	<u>Donor</u>	<u>Estates</u>	<u>S</u>
639	Coenwalh	Chilcomb, Hampshire Downton, Wiltshire Alresford, Hampshire Worthy, Hampshire	- 229 - -
683	Ine	Yaverland, IOW, 30 hides Brading, IOW, 50 hides	- -
721	Frithuswith Æthilheard	Taunton, Somerset 7 additional hides	254 254
735	Cuthred	'Muleburna', IOW, 40 hides 'Banewada', IOW, 25 hides Whippingham, IOW, 22 hides 'Druca' (i.e. 'Thruhham') Highclere	- - - 259 258
828	Ecgberht	Calbourne, IOW, 30 hides Shalfleet, IOW, 42 hides Droxford, Hampshire Worthy, Hampshire Alton Priors, Wiltshire Beddington, Surrey	274 281 276 273 272 -

The other early grants mentioned by the annalist but not recorded in surviving charters are those by Ine and Cuthred of lands on the Isle of Wight. None of the place-names involved occurs in any pre-Conquest charter, and none of the estates is recorded elsewhere as a possession of Winchester, so motive for forgery cannot be demonstrated. The Isle of Wight was conquered and control of its lands seized by Ceadwalla in the 680s, and it remained within the diocese of Winchester even after the creation of the South Saxon see at Selsey (HE IV 16, V 23), so grants of estates there by eighth-century kings of Wessex to Winchester are quite plausible. It is noticeable that the annalist includes hidages only for lands on the Isle of Wight, and in the case of Shalfleet the figure differs from that in the extant charter. It seems likely that he was using a separate source for transactions relating to the Isle of Wight, but there is no evidence to suggest what this source was. The statements of grants in the annals are extremely brief, including no more detail than is given in the list above and furnishing no direct evidence that the writer worked from charters. It is possible that Winchester did at one time possess charters in which Ine and Cuthred granted these estates, and that these charters were authentic, but the evidence cannot be said to establish more than a possibility.

(d) Winchester Charters: Conclusions

15 charters in the Winchester cartulary purport to date from the period down to the end of Ecgberht's reign. Of these only four appear to be genuine:-

<u>S</u>	<u>Details</u>
235	Ceadwalla grants Farnham to Ceadda, Cisi and Criswa
259	Cuthred grants <u>Ihruhham</u> to Winchester
1263	Bishop Ealhmund exchanges lands with Berthelm
283	Ecgberht grants land on the river Meon to Wulfheard.

There are indications that certain other transactions may have taken place, although the evidence for these is far from conclusive:-

- ECW 1 Ine grants Yaverland and Brading, IOW, to Winchester
- ECW 4 Cuthred grants Muleburna, Banewada and Whippingham, IOW, to Winchester

S272 Ecgberht grants Alton Priors to Burhheard.

Only in the case of Farnham is it possible to be certain that land not recorded as a direct grant to Winchester came into its possession within this period. Winchester's only recorded acquisitions of land down to 839 are therefore 60 hides at Farnham, Surrey, and 7 hides at Thruhham, Hampshire. The see may also have acquired estates totalling 167 hides on the Isle of Wight.

There are records in the cartularies of Wilton, Evesham and New Minster, Winchester, of grants of land on the Isle of Wight, but none of these is earlier than the mid-tenth century (S543, 842, 1662-3). Only Old Minster claimed to have acquired lands there at an early date. The only other source of information about the early history of the island is Bede who has information independent of Eddius (HE IV 16). After conquering the island, Ceadwalla granted a quarter of it, comprising 300 hides, to Wilfrid. The land was handed over by Wilfrid to his nephew Beornwine, who was appointed missionary to the Isle of Wight and was given a priest, Hiddila, to assist him. The mission to the Isle of Wight is not heard of again, the only recorded conversions being the work of abbot Cyniberht of Redbridge on the mainland, but Bede states that the island was brought within the diocese of Winchester in the time of Daniel, and it afterwards remained under the jurisdiction of the see. It may be that the estates recorded as grants to Winchester had earlier been among those owned by Beornwine's mission, and had reverted to the West Saxon royal family on the failure of the mission,

being then restored to the church in the form of grants to the see. Cuthred's grant of Thruhham is, however, the only transaction of the period which can be accepted with any confidence as a direct royal grant to Winchester.

The charter evidence does not therefore suggest that Winchester was of any great importance in this period. It is, however, quite possible that Winchester received a substantial endowment in the seventh century when the see was first permanently established there, and Finberg points out that after the division of the diocese in 705, the first priority of Ine and his successors must have been to provide for the new see (ECW, p. 217). These considerations may account for the meagre acquisitions by Winchester during the eighth and early ninth centuries.

4. ABINGDON

	<u>Page</u>
a) <u>Introduction</u>	266
b) <u>The Charters</u>	267
<u>S</u>	
1603 Ceadwalla to Abingdon	268
252 Ine to Hæha and Ceolswith	269
1179 Hæha to Ceolswith	273
239 Ine to Hæha	276
241 Ine to Hæha	279
93 Æthilbald to Abingdon	284
269 Beorhtric to Hemele	288
268 Beorhtric to Lulla	294
166 Coenwulf to Abingdon	296
184 Coenwulf to Abingdon	300
183 Coenwulf to Abingdon	303
278 Ecgberht to Abingdon	308
c) <u>Conclusions</u>	312

(a) Introduction

The pre-Conquest charters of Abingdon survive principally in two medieval cartularies and a few single sheets, all part of the Cotton collection in the British Library. The cartularies are also chronicles in which a narrative, chiefly relating to the history of the monastery, is illustrated by the charters which are transcribed (Davis 1958, nos. 3 and 4; Keynes 1980, p. 10; Stenton 1913, pp. 1-2; Stevenson, Abingdon Chron., pp. v-xv). The documents in the earlier manuscript, Cotton Claudius C ix, relate to the period from the seventh century to the 1160s, and the collection appears to have been made at the latter date; the extant manuscript is usually considered to be a copy of the early thirteenth century. The other manuscript, Cotton Claudius B vi, written in a hand of the late thirteenth century, incorporates a revised and expanded narrative and many more charters, although a few charters in the earlier manuscript are omitted. The scribe of the later cartulary evidently did not use the earlier volume as his exemplar for the charters, since his transcriptions are frequently fuller and more accurate than those of the earlier scribe. For the period down to 839 the narratives of the chronicle-cartularies are of little value, consisting of information from the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, inferences drawn from the charters, and traditions which may have had no basis in fact and cannot be relied upon. It is only the charters themselves which are potential evidence for the early period.

The Abingdon chronicle-cartulary was edited for the Rolls Series in 1858 by J. Stevenson (Stevenson, Abingdon Chron.), whose text is based on the later manuscript, as providing a better version of the charters, but incorporates different readings from the earlier volume. A rather better edition of the charters is provided by Birch, who was also able to work from both manuscripts. In 1913 Stenton published

an account of the pre-Conquest history of Abingdon which included discussions of several individual charters and showed how the charters could be used as evidence for the monastery itself and more generally for the history of the period (Stenton 1913). This is still a very useful piece of work, and the present discussion is greatly indebted to it.

(b) The Charters

The charters surviving in the archive of Abingdon or otherwise connected with the house and relating to the period down to 839 are listed below.

<u>S</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Donor</u>	<u>Beneficiary</u>
1603	(685 x 688)	Ceadwalla, king	Abingdon
252	(688 x 704)	Ine, king	Hæha and Ceolswith
1179	(705 x 726)	Hæha, abbot	Ceolswith
239	(705 x 726)	Ine, king	Hæha, abbot
241	(688 x 726)	Ine, king	Hæha, abbot
93	(709 x 737)	Æthilbald, king	Abingdon
269	(786 x 794)	Beorhtric, king	Hemele
268	801	Beorhtric, king	Lulla
166	(811 x 816)	Coenwulf, king	Abingdon
184	(806 x 821)	Coenwulf, king	Abingdon
183	821	Coenwulf, king	Abingdon
278	835	Ecgerht, king	Abingdon

* * * * *

S1603

B.L., Cotton Claudius C ix, fo. 105r.

(Edition: B844)

The earlier cartulary includes a brief Latin passage which, according to the cartularist's narrative, is the latter part of a charter of Ceadwalla relating to 20 hides at Abingdon. This was dismissed by Stenton as 'certainly spurious' (Stenton 1913, p. 9), and a rather fuller discussion by Margaret Gelling entirely supports this conclusion and establishes that the alleged seventh-century fragment is merely a 'ghost charter' (ECTV, nos. 142, 64).

The cartularist's rubric states that Ceadwalla gave 20 hides at Abingdon to God and the monks serving God there. The passage which follows, and purports to be part of Ceadwalla's charter, records that the wood named 'Ædeleahing' and also 'Colmonora' and 'Geatescum' belong to the 20 hides which the donor himself has measured partly by riding and partly by sailing, and there follows a sanction which includes provision for a transgressor to make amends. Of the three place-names only Colmonora survives. It is now Cumnor in Berkshire, and is the subject of a dubious charter in the name of Eadgar dated 968 granting the land to Abingdon (S757). It was still owned by the abbey in 1066 (DB Berkshire, pp. 7.1, 4, 5).

A spurious charter in the name of Eadred (S567) includes a set of Old English bounds which are preceded by a heading stating that they relate to an area of 20 hides at Abingdon given to the monastery by Ceadwalla, and followed by a passage in Old English which is the counterpart of the Latin text said to derive from Ceadwalla's charter. This passage, with its account of traversing the estate, clearly belongs with the detailed boundary clause, and therefore cannot derive from a charter of the seventh century when such clauses were unknown. The sanction

is of a type not normally used so early. The alleged fragment of a charter of Ceadwalla therefore appears to be, as Dr. Gelling has argued, a Latin translation of the Old English passage which was probably drawn up not earlier than the tenth century. This passage indicated that someone at Abingdon either believed or invented a story that Ceadwalla granted 20 hides at Abingdon itself to the house. There is no reason to believe, however, that this story had any foundation.

Ceadwalla's name appears in some other Abingdon charters, all of them spurious, and he is usually cited as the donor of Abingdon itself (S241 in the version in MS Cotton Claudius C ix; S93, 183, 567, 658, 673). It does not appear that the use of his name served any practical purpose, and it probably just reflects the desire of the community at Abingdon after Æthelwald's refoundation of the house to trace its history back to the early years of Christianity in England and connect it with the famous kings mentioned by Bede.

* * * * *

S252

B.L., Cotton Claudius C ix, fo. 105v.

(Edition: B74)

A charter in the name of Ine surviving only in the earlier cartulary appears to be basically authentic although a few anachronistic details suggest some later interpolation. Stenton's discussion of the charter includes a number of helpful points (Stenton 1913, pp. 12-14), but he regarded the document as relating to Abingdon itself, and there is reason to think that this was not the case, but that this and other documentation relating to another monastery came into Abingdon's possession at a later date.

The surviving text has no invocation or proem, no sanction or blessing and no dating clause. It may be that the charter has been abbreviated by a copyist, but equally the document may have been drawn up in this very brief form originally. There are a number of other instances of notably brief charters of early date (Eg. S1167, 1168, 1249, 1253), and the clauses which survive are themselves very succinct.

The dispositio records that Ine, 'rex Westsaxonum' granted 45 hides of land in three places to 'Hean patricio et Ceolswiðe' for the foundation of a monastery. 'Hean' is the oblique form of Hæha; patricius, as is discussed elsewhere, was a title used of noblemen in the seventh and eighth centuries. This man should probably be identified with the 'Hæha abbas' who attests Ine's general grant of privileges in 704 (S245); he presumably became abbot of the house whose foundation is envisaged in this charter. Since Hæha is still a layman at the time of this transaction, the charter must date from 688 x 704. The personal name Ceolswith is not otherwise recorded, and is most unlikely to have been invented. The single dubious detail in the dispositio is the West Saxon royal title; at this date it was usually 'rex Saxonum' or simply 'rex', and the title in this charter has probably been introduced into the text at a later date.

The document includes three lots of attestations which may usefully be quoted in full:-

1. 'Cui donationi testes affuerant Ebba . Æthilbald . et Eadfrith filius Iddi .'
2. 'et cum iussione episcoporum Cedde Germani Þinfridi .'
3. 'Ego Theodorus seruus dei archiepiscopus consensi et subscripsi .'

There are a number of reasons for considering the first lot of witnesses to be genuine. None of the four persons mentioned here is otherwise recorded (unless, as is not impossible, Eadfrith is to be identified with the Mercian princeps of this name who attests a charter of 675 x 697: S1806), and their invention is unlikely as it would serve no

purpose. The spelling 'Æthilbald' indicates a seventh- or eighth-century exemplar. The names Ebba and Iddi are of the one-element type common at this date but which had become obsolete by the tenth century, and Iddi is otherwise unrecorded except in place-names (Stenton 1913, p. 13 and n. 1). The wording of the clause differs from the conventional witness list of an Anglo-Saxon charter, and rather resembles the type of wording used in early Welsh charters (Davies 1982, pp. 263-4), but there are some parallels in Anglo-Saxon documents of early date (S1802, 1805, 1806), so it seems possible that witness lists were drawn up in this form in some of the earliest Anglo-Saxon charters, but that the practice very quickly fell into disuse.

The list of bishops appears to be an interpolation. No holder of an English see active during the reign of Ine bore any of these three names, and it seems likely that they have been borrowed from the Mercian episcopal list: in the mid seventh century the see was held consecutively by Jaruman, Chad and Wynfrith, who appear in the earliest extant manuscript of the episcopal lists as 'Gearomon Ceadda Wynfrið' (Page 1966, p. 5). Theodore's subscription is also likely to be a later addition: he was a very famous man whose name would have been readily available to a forger, and it seems most unlikely that the same document could have contained both his form of subscription and the very different one introducing the lay witnesses. Stenton sums up all four clerical attestations as 'an unhappy addition for purposes of embellishment'.

The remaining sentence of the charter states that Eadfrith son of Iddi had first granted the land on the altar in the church which was built there. The invention of this earlier transaction is highly unlikely, and the reference to a ceremony at an altar is paralleled in three charters of the mid-eighth century (S256, 257, 1410). The ceremony may have resembled the one mentioned in some earlier charters

which involved placing a sod from the land conveyed on a copy of the gospels (S1164, 1804, 1805, 1806. But cf. S1165 where king Wulfhere is said simply to have placed his hand on the altar).

The land is said to be situated 'in Bradanfelda et Bestlesforda . et alia que nominatur Stretlea'. These places are now Bradfield, Basildon and Streatley in Berkshire, within a few miles of each other and some 15 miles from Abingdon. All three recur in one or more of the group of early charters connected with this one which survive in the Abingdon archive and are discussed below. Bradfield was in lay hands in the 990s and in 1066 (S1454; DB Berkshire, p. 22.2). Basildon occurs in a Winchester record among lands given to king Ælfred by bishop Denewulf in exchange for others, and was in lay hands in 1066 (S354; DB Berkshire, p. 1.8).

The course of events may be reconstructed as follows. Eadfrith owned the 45 hides of land and gave or sold them to Hæha and Ceolswith for the foundation of a monastery. Evidently there was already a church on the estate at the time of this grant; possibly there had been an earlier religious establishment on the site. Ine either confirmed the grant or restored the land after it had been taken from the owners for some reason, and a monastery was established there of which Hæha became abbot. Some time later the documentation relating to this monastery came into the possession of Abingdon, probably because that house acquired the estates, although there is no direct evidence that Abingdon ever owned any part of the land which is the subject of this charter. The monastery at Bradfield may have come under Abingdon's control, or may have ceased to exist, or may have been a predecessor of Abingdon itself, the community moving to another site. The lands subsequently passed out of Abingdon's possession, perhaps during the period preceding the effective refoundation by Æthelwold.

S1179

B.L., Cotton Claudius C ix, fos. 105v-106r.

(Edition: B29)

A brief charter in the name of abbot Hæha survives in both cartularies and is described in the cartularists' rubrics as Hæha's 'testament'. Stenton dismissed the document on the grounds that it bears no resemblance to authentic Anglo-Saxon wills (Stenton 1913, p. 9), but in fact the word testamentum does not necessarily mean 'will' (ECWM, p. 201 n. 1), and moreover the authenticity of a document is not affected by a rubric added to it by a cartularist at a much later date. The document is in fact a charter recording a grant of land which is apparently of immediate effect, and as such it deserves serious consideration.

Hæha grants lands at Bradfield and elsewhere to his sister Cille with reversion to himself if still living at her death, otherwise to 'istud monasterium'. The last phrase evidently refers back to 'Bradandfeld', and therefore implies that the monastery was built on the Bradfield estate. There is no dating clause, but the confirmation of king Ine and bishop Daniel is mentioned, so the charter must date from 705 x 726, that is between the consecration of Daniel and the abdication of Ine. It is reasonable to suppose that Hæha's sister is to be identified with the joint beneficiary of Ine's grant, and that Cille is the hypocoristic form of Ceolswith (Stenton 1913, p. 13). The existence of two wholly different versions of the name strongly suggests that there are two basically authentic documents: if one of the charters were forged and the name borrowed from the other, it would appear in the same form in both. 'Hean', conversely, appears here erroneously as a nominative, but this may be just the error of a post-Conquest copyist who was accustomed to seeing the name in this form and did not fully understand Old English declensions. There is another early instance of a grant of land by a man to his sister (S45), and other instances of charters providing for reversion to

religious houses occur from the early eighth century onwards (S1254, 109, etc.). The dispositio mentions that the grant relates to a portion of the land 'que mihi ex munificentia parentum meorum qui regni gubernacula potiri noscuntur in potestate concessa fuerat'. The wording recalls a phrase in an interpolated seventh-century Glastonbury charter referring to the consent of 'ceterorum cognatorum gubernacula regni regentium' (S236) which encourages the supposition that both clauses are genuine. The reference here is presumably to Ine, and implies that Hæha was a member of the royal family, but it is possible that Eadfrith is also meant and that all three men were related.

Nothing in the wording of the charter appears anachronistic. Hæha's title 'dispensante domino abbas' resembles royal titles used in early charters (S235, 1169, 231); the clause 'cum adiacentibus nec minus aliis sicut infra signatum est locis' is not unlike one in a charter of Ceadwalla, 'ceteros autem propriis locis et nominibus adsignantur' (S235); the sanction is in quite usual terms, and the inclusion of the witnesses' names in the body of the text, and not at the end with individual subscriptions, is paralleled in the grant of Ine to Hæha and Ceolswith and elsewhere (S252, 1410; and in 'Celtic' charters, see Davies 1978).

The charter grants a total of 183 hides of land consisting of 48 hides at 'Bradanford', now Bradfield; 55 at 'Escesdune', i.e. Ashdown, which was an earlier name for the Berkshire Downs; and 83 at 'Æarmundeslea', a name which has been interpreted as denoting a large area in Berkshire including Appleton, Eaton, Bessels Leigh (which before the fifteenth century was simply Leigh, and perhaps represents an abbreviated form of 'Æaromundeslea') and possibly some other parishes (PN Berkshire, Vol. 1, pp. 2-3; Vol. 2, pp. 442-4). The stated total number of hides is 3 hides short of the actual sum of the three estates,

and perhaps the Bradfield estate should be an area of 45 hides as in Ine's charter. Bradfield is discussed above. In 840 Æthelwulf granted 10 hides on Ashdown to a layman (S288), but it is impossible to be certain whether this land was part of the 55 hides given to Cille. Ashdown is not named in Domesday Book. 'Æaromundeslea' occurs only in this charter and other Abingdon documents connected with it (S183, 239, 673). In 1066 Abingdon held Bessels Leigh which was assessed at 1 hide; Appleton and Eaton were held by a laymen (DB Berkshire, pp. 7.20; 33.6, 7). Evidently neither the name nor the large estate of Æaromundeslea survived in later years, and the name appears to have been an ancient one which would not have been known to a forger. Nor is it likely that a forged charter would have taken the form of a grant to Cille with reversion to Hæha or Bradfield, and the document is probably substantially authentic.

The evidence relating to Hæha indicates that he became abbot of the monastery he founded at Bradfield. It is not clear what role his sister played, but it may be that she was also a member of the community and that the establishment was a family monastery of the type to which Bede objected (Bede's Letter to Ecgberht: Plummer 1896, pp. 413-7). Later writers sometimes assumed that Ceolswith was an abbess, but she is not given this title in either of the two authentic charters in which she is named. The purpose of this grant appears to have been to ensure provision for her out of the Bradfield estates in the event of her surviving Hæha, but the wording suggests that the transaction took immediate effect, and the arrangement may have been made by Hæha at the end of his life (Cf. the death-bed grant of Dunne, S1429).

S239

B.L., Cotton Claudius C ix, fo. 105v.

(Edition: B100)

A charter in the name of Ine, extant in the earlier cartulary, appears to be a composite work incorporating names and other details borrowed from a number of genuine early charters, and is itself probably a fabrication.

This interpretation is suggested first by the fact that the transaction recorded here duplicates that in the other charter of Ine discussed above: the king grants to Hæha lands in four places, 15 hides at Bradfield, 15 at Basildon, 25 at Streatley and 80 at Æaromundeslea. It is therefore scarcely possible that both documents are genuine. The different hidages here perhaps reflect the organisation of the estates at a later date, while the fourth estate has probably been borrowed from the charter recording Hæha's grant to Ceolswith. Ine's title appears here exactly as in the other charter in his name, 'rex Westsaxonum', and the beneficiary is described in a form of words which reads rather oddly, 'Dispensante enim domino Hean abbati', and which appears to be borrowed from the title used in Hæha's own charter.

The document is dated the 5th July, the 12th indiction, 687. It is probably not significant that the incarnational date fits neither the reign of Ine nor the indiction, since years of grace were often interpolated into authentic early charters which lacked them. A more serious inconsistency is the presence in the witness list of Æthilred, king of the Mercians, who abdicated in 704, and Daniel, bishop of Winchester, who was consecrated in 705. These men could not appear together, and their names indicate that there has at least been some tampering with the text. Another feature which tends to suggest forgery is the emphasis on strengthening the document so that it may last for ever:-

'Que scilicet donationes ut firmitus ac tenatius reliquum durarent in eum . etiam coram summis pontificibus id est Brihtwallo archiepiscopo et Daniele episcopo peracte sunt';

'Porro ut firmior prefate donationis largitio inextricabili tenacitate iugiter seruaretur . etiam testes adiunximus quorum nomina subter tenentur inserta'.

Some details of this text do not derive from either of the authentic charters discussed above, but do seem to have originated in a genuine early charter, and therefore suggest that a third genuine record was available to the compiler of this document. A clause describing how sods from the estates were placed on a book held by archbishop Berhtwald and bishop Daniel can scarcely derive from the simple reference to a gift made at an altar in the genuine charter of Ine discussed above, and resembles clauses in other early charters, especially the earliest extant West Saxon charter, Coenred's grant to abbot Bectun:-

S239: 'cespites horum locorum pro ampliore firmitate libro super posui';

S1164: 'earundem supradictarum cespites pro ampliore firmitate euangelium super posui'

(See also S1804, 1805, 1806).

The names of kings Ine and Æthilred, archbishop Berhtwald and bishop Daniel might have been taken from Bede or the Chronicle, but there are two other subscriptions which do not appear to derive from narrative sources and could have originated in one or more early charters. One is of a layman named Æthilfrith who is probably to be identified with the witness of Ine's general grant of privileges of 704 and of another charter which is a fabrication but whose author perhaps made use of a genuine witness list of Ine's reign (S245; B114). The other should be compared with a subscription in the charter of Coenred mentioned above:-

S239: 'Ego Winberctus hanc cartam scripsi et subscripsi';

S1164: 'Ego Wimbertus presbiter qui hanc cartulam rogantes supra effato abbate scripsi et subscripsi'.

Such scribal attestations, involving abbot Wynberht of Nursling and others, are confined to a small group of West Saxon charters dating from the period 670-682 and surviving in different archives (See S236). The presence of this wording here can only be explained on the assumption that it appeared in a genuine, early West Saxon charter used by the author of this text. It may be that several other clauses in the extant document derive from the same charter. Some of the wording is quite unobjectionable in itself and does not duplicate anything in the two genuine charters discussed above. The dating clause, apart from the incarnational year, might be genuine and would suggest that a charter of 684, 699 or possibly 714 was used.

Nothing in this charter is of identifiably tenth-century or later date, and it may be that it is a forgery produced fairly early, possibly at the monastery of Bradfield itself. The last sentence of the document, which states that the land is subject to the church of St. Mary at Abingdon, could have been added later. It appears, however, that the document is basically a fabrication, probably intended as an improved version of the genuine charter of Ine, and, in its extant form, as Abingdon's title-deed for the Bradfield estates. Some parts of the surviving text appear to derive from an authentic early charter which is not now extant: the account of the ceremony at an altar, part of the witness list, the dating clause, and perhaps some other details of the wording. But the chief content of the charter concerned is unknown.

* * * * *

S241

B.L., Cotton Claudius B vi, fo. 6rv.

(Edition: B101)

This document is certainly a fabrication. It contains a complicated and rather incoherent narrative which recounts several grants of land and various other transactions. It includes a number of phrases which would never have appeared in a seventh-century charter, such as 'terram ... rei publice restituit' and 'Ine monarcus Saxonie', and ends with a witness list headed by Ine and including bishop Daniel, but otherwise consisting of the entourage of Æthilbald of Mercia. Nevertheless, the text is of some value since it appears that this charter, like the previous one, is based to some extent on authentic early documents, some of which do not survive. It may represent an attempt to write an account of the early history of Abingdon.

The document survives in both cartularies, but the versions differ in that the earlier manuscript begins its account with the name of 'Ceadwalla rex Westsaxonum' while the later one quotes the name of 'Ine rex Saxonum'. The first part of the narrative recounts that Ceadwalla or Ine restored to abbot Hæda an estate of 173 hides at Abingdon which had previously been granted to Hæha and his sister, abbess Cille, by king Cissa. But Ine took the land back into public ownership because no monastery had yet been built, and subsequently restored it to Hæha and Ceolswith for the foundation of a monastery. Whether the first name is Ine or Ceadwalla makes a substantial difference to the sense of this narrative. If Ceadwalla is the correct reading, there were three grants of the same land to the same beneficiaries, one by Cissa, the next by Ceadwalla following some loss or confiscation of which no mention is made here, and the third by Ine following a second confiscation. The narrative makes much better sense if the

first name is Ine's. On this basis it seems that the author begins by referring to Ine's restoration of the land, then digresses to explain the background to this, the grant by Cissa, delay in constructing the monastery and confiscation by Ine of the estate, before re-stating Ine's restoration in more detail. It seems likely that this more plausible account represents the author's intentions, and that the later cartulary's reading of the first name is the correct one. The fact that it is the later cartulary which gets the king's title right endorses this view, as does the fact that the later cartulary provides a better text of some other charters. The account of Ine's restoration of the estate to Hæha and his sister is clearly based on the extant foundation charter discussed above, which itself refers to an earlier grant and uses the term 'reddidi'; and it appears that use was also made of Hæha's grant to Ceolswith, which would inform the compiler of their relationship and provide the short form of Ceolswith's name which is used here.

So far the text is fairly simple, but the next section is more difficult to understand. This takes the form of a first-person narrative by an unnamed man who is said to have been appointed abbot of the new monastery at Abingdon by Hæha who himself became a monk. But less than five years after taking his monastic vows, Hæha desired to be released from them, and he (or possibly Ine - the text is so ungrammatical and incoherent that it is impossible to be certain who is meant) suddenly took the property by hereditary right. The abbot therefore gave back to Hæha (or Ine, or both) a number of properties which the text details and which may be listed as follows:-

1. The estate already mentioned, that is 173 hides at Abingdon, plus the monasteries built on it;

2. 20 hides on the east bank of the Thames ('Tamise') given to the abbot by Cuthred regulus, Æthilred of Mercia and Ine.
3. 10 hides at Basildon ('Bestlesford') and 100 at Bradfield ('Bradenfeld') where the abbot has built a monastery, given by Ine and Coenred.

The total number of hides is said to be 273: it is difficult to account for this as a scribal error, so the author's mathematics is probably at fault. The narrative ends by stating that the abbot then released Hæha from his monastic vows in the presence of bishop Hæddi, abbot Aldhelm, Wintra, and all the monastic community.

Stenton interpreted this account of Hæha's return to lay life as a further explanation of the events leading up to the confiscation of the lands before Ine's restoration (Stenton 1913, p. 14). This is not what the text says: the introductory word 'Deinde' suggests that these events followed Ine's regrant of the land; there is reference to monasteries having been built, whereas the confiscation was said to have occurred because no monastery had yet been constructed; and Hæha's return to lay life seems to be intended as the last in the chronological sequence of events. However, the confusion of the text and the author's evident inability to write a piece of coherent Latin prose make it impossible to be certain what he intended to convey, and Stenton's view of the matter could be correct. It does at least have the merit of making the document as a whole reasonably explicable as merely a recital of events culminating in a grant of land for the foundation of Abingdon. A monk of the house who had the authentic foundation charter before him, and wished to reconcile it with other evidence or beliefs, might well have produced such a document.

It is less easy to account for the document if the author intended what the text actually says: that the founder returned to lay life after less than five years from the date of the foundation, and that

the monastery itself and a considerable amount of land were then transferred into lay ownership. It is impossible to imagine why anyone at Abingdon should have taken such pains to record this narrative, whether it were true or false. The story reflects so little credit on the man who was apparently believed to have been, and was certainly represented as, Abingdon's founder, as to suggest that it could not have been invented and must be authentic. But in some details the account can actually be disproved: Hæha did not become a monk under another man's authority but was abbot himself, as is shown by his attestation in this capacity of an authentic charter independent of Abingdon records (S245); and his grant to his sister, made when he was abbot and attested by bishop Daniel, indicates that he did not leave clerical life during Hæddi's episcopate. No conclusion can be offered here as to whether the account has any basis in fact, or why and in what circumstances it was written out in the surviving document.

Some deductions can be made, however, on the basis of certain details in the text, about some of the materials used by the compiler. The witness list consists of the names of king Ine, king Æthilbald, bishop Daniel and nine laymen. Five of these are unknown, but the other four, Stronglic, Oba, Selred and Aldberht, attest charters of Æthilbald (Stronlic: S94, 102; Oba: S85-9, 91, 94, etc.; Selred: S87; Aldberht: S95). It therefore appears probable that the list derives from a charter of Æthilbald and has been altered only by the addition of two names to suit a charter of Ine. Æthilbald's charter does not survive and there is no evidence to suggest what it said, but it may well have been a grant to the monastery of Bradfield: this house, like Malmesbury, was near the West Saxon/Mercian border, and may have received patronage from both kingdoms.

Use of an authentic early West Saxon charter is suggested by the inclusion of a proem asserting the need for written records which also occurs in the earliest extant West Saxon charter, Coenred's grant to Bectun, and a number of other early West Saxon and East Saxon charters (S1164, 1169, 248, 65, 1784, etc.). The dating clause could well be basically genuine (cf. S248), and the names of Coenred (in an early spelling), bishop Hæddi, abbot Aldhelm and Wintra, presumably to be identified with the abbot of Tisbury, may also be taken from one or more early charters. It is quite possible that all these details plus the conveyancing ceremony and scribal attestation preserved in the other spurious charter in Ine's name discussed above, derive from a single early West Saxon charter, perhaps a grant of Coenred, and apparently resembling Coenred's single surviving charter.

The place-names Basildon and Bradfield are doubtless derived from the authentic foundation charter of Bradfield discussed above. The reference to an estate at Abingdon merely reflects the evident confusion of Bradfield records with Abingdon records at Abingdon in later years, and need not be presumed to derive from any authentic early document. The estate on the Thames cannot be identified in the absence of other details of its situation, but could well have been granted to Bradfield in an early charter available to the compiler of this text. The donors are cited as sub-king Cuthred, Æthilred of Mercia and Ine. Ine was certainly a benefactor of Bradfield and Æthilred may well have been also, as he was of Malmesbury, or alternatively his name may have been borrowed from the Chronicle. Cuthred, nephew of king Coenwalh, exercised authority over an extensive area of the Berkshire Downs and died, according to the Chronicle, in 661 (ASC s.a. 639, 648, 661). If he was really a benefactor

of Bradfield, then the house was founded at a very early date, long before Ine granted land to Hæha 'ad construendum monasterium'. While this cannot be said to be wholly impossible, it seems more likely that Cuthred's name has been taken from the Chronicle, chosen because of his connection with Berkshire. The early king named Cissa mentioned in this charter is unknown outside Abingdon records. He may have been an early ruler, comparable with such men as Cuthred, and known to the author of this document from a genuine early charter, but the evidence is too vague and suspect for certainty. Identification with the layman Cisi who appears in a number of early charters (S231, 235, 1170, 1248) is not impossible.

This document furnished evidence for the former existence of early West Saxon and Mercian charters, probably recording grants of land to Hæha's monastery at Bradfield. Other information about the house and the people connected with it which is peculiar to this document, for example the assertion that Ceolswith was an abbess, cannot be relied upon. The use of the Bradfield records and the name of the Bradfield founder to provide a history of the foundation of Abingdon strongly suggests that there were no authentic early records relating to Abingdon itself and hence that that monastery was not founded until a later date. It appears, however, that the Abingdon community wished to trace the history of their house back to the 7th century, and the purpose of this document was probably to annex Bradfield's history as well as its estates.

* * * * *

S93

B.L., Cotton Claudius B vi, fo. 13r.

(Edition: B155)

A curious charter which survives in both cartularies seems to have been intended by its author to be regarded as a charter of Æthilbald of Mercia, but the document bears no resemblance to authentic eighth-century texts and appears to be a fabrication, although one or two details in it may derive from genuine early records.

The document begins with a very long proem which might have formed part of a tenth-century charter but could scarcely have been drafted in the eighth century, and this is followed by a statement that it is judged useful to set out the amount of land owned by the monastery of St. Mary at Abingdon ruled by abbot Cumma. The possessions of the abbey are then summarised in two parts: lands west of the Thames totalling 250 hides are said to have been given by the West Saxon kings Cissa, Ceadwalla and Ine; and the Mercian kings Æthilred, Cuthred and Coenred are said to have given lands east of the Thames totalling 274 hides. (This figure appears only in the later cartulary. In Cotton Claudius C ix the figure denoting the number of hides has been erased and was evidently different, as there is space for only two to three digits.). A grant by king Æthilbald to the monastery is then reported in the third person, the estates being at Watchfield and Ginge in Berkshire, and he is also said to confirm all the grants of earlier kings. There is no sanction or dating clause and the witness list follows.

Neither the wording nor the content of this text resemble those of authentic charters of Æthilbald or other early kings. The author apparently made use of the same traditions or documentation as the author of the fabrication in Ine's name just discussed. He evidently did not know who Cuthred and Coenred were and guessed that they were Mercian kings: the writer of a genuine charter of Æthilbald is unlikely to have been so ignorant of earlier Mercian rulers.

Abbot Cumma is not otherwise known and his name may have been taken from a charter, but this is not certain, and there is no evidence for the date at which he lived.

The witness list may have some authentic basis. It consists of the subscriptions of Æthilbald and four bishops plus a confirmatory endorsement by king Æthilheard of Wessex. King Æthilbald's attestation appears to be either spurious or much re-written, since it gives his title as 'Britannie Anglorum monarcus', and records his confirmation of the grants of earlier kings. The bishops are Daniel of Winchester, Worr of Lichfield, Forthere of Sherborne and Wealhstod of Hereford. All four are mentioned by Bede in his list of bishops active in 731 (HE V 23), but Worr is there given his other name, Ealdwine, which makes it unlikely that the names have been borrowed from Bede's account. Bishop Daniel's usual humility formula, 'plebi dei famulus', is used, and the subscription forms of all four bishops, as they appear in the later cartulary (in the other manuscript the subscriptions have been elaborated and each bishop attests with a different verb in tenth-century style), are unobjectionable except that Forthere's includes the phrase 'in Banesinga uilla iubente rege', which appears curious in an attestation and has perhaps been borrowed from a dating clause. These four attestations may well derive from a genuine charter of 709 x 737, that is between Forthere's consecration and Worr's death (HE V 18, SAC s.a. 709; Historia Regum s.a. 737), but it is not certain that this was a charter of Æthilbald; it may have been a grant by some other donor or the record of the proceedings of a synod.

Æthilheard's subscription, which is preserved only in the later cartulary, states that he confirms the above grant with his companions who are named below 'in expedicione ultra fluuium Sabrina aduersus

Britonum gentem'. The names of the companions are not preserved. This wording is probably genuine: it is similar to a dating clause of the reign of Ecgberht said to be written 'in hoste quando Ecgberhtus rex Geuuissorum mouet contra Brittones' (S272, 273), a forger would probably not have referred to the names of the king's companions since he would not have known them; and there is nothing anachronistic in the wording. The subscription probably originated in the same document as the episcopal attestations. It provides evidence of an otherwise unrecorded campaign of Æthilheard against the Welsh (of Wales, not Cornwall), an event which is somewhat surprising since the extent of Æthilbald's power rather suggests that Mercia stood between Wessex and Wales. It may be that the expedition was a joint West Saxon and Mercian operation, such as seems to have occurred in Cuthred's reign (ASC s.a. 743), in which case the document attested may well have been a charter of Æthilbald. It is quite possible that the name of Æthilbald, the four episcopal attestations and the endorsement by Æthilheard preserved in this document, and the list of laymen appended to the fabrication in Ine's name discussed above, all originated in an authentic charter of Æthilbald's reign.

The two estates recorded in this charter as gifts of Æthilbald are 26 hides at 'Wachenesfeld', now Watchfield, and 10 hides 'iuxta rium Geenge', now Ginge. Both estates were part of Abingdon's Domesday endowment and were assessed at 20 and 10 hides respectively in 1066 (DB Berkshire, pp. 7.36, 7.45). Watchfield occurs also in a spurious Abingdon pancarta (S183) and was the subject of a grant by Æthelstan to a layman dated 931 now in the Abingdon archive (S413), which suggests that the land was acquired by Abingdon in the tenth or eleventh century, and that the reference to Watchfield in this charter was intended as evidence that the monastery had owned the estate for longer than

was actually the case. Ginge appears in a number of charters, all of which seem to be spurious and were apparently designed to provide a sequence of records from the 8th century onwards supporting Abingdon's claim to the estate (S166, 183, 567, 583, 673). It is not impossible that Watchfield and Ginge were both acquired by Abingdon at an early date but this document cannot be considered evidence of any such acquisitions, since it appears to be a fabrication. It probably preserves part of the witness list of an authentic 8th century charter, but its content cannot be presumed to reflect the content of that charter in any way.

* * * * *

S269

B.L., Cotton Claudius B vi, fo. 10v.

(Edition: B258)

A charter recording an exchange of lands between king Beorhtric and ealdorman Hemele survives only in the later cartulary. There is no good reason to doubt its authenticity. The document is undated but can be assigned to the period 786-794, that is from the accession of Beorhtric to the latest possible date for the death of bishop Æthilmod of Sherborne who attests: his successor, Denefrith, first appears in 794 (S137; also S139, 149). It is therefore probable that this is the earliest extant charter of the reign, the others dating from 794 and 801 (S267, 268, 270a).

The wording is simple and straightforward with no anachronisms, and incorporates a number of phrases closely resembling phrases used in other charters of the time. The ablative absolute type of invocation became much more common from the late eighth century onwards, and occurs in two other charters of the reign:-

S269: 'Regnante in perpetuum omnipotenti Deo';

S267: 'Regnante in perpetuum Domino nostro Iesu Christo ...';

S270a: 'Regnante in perpetuum domino nostro Ihesu Christo ...'.

Beorhtric's royal title resembles those in his other two surviving charters in not naming the people ruled as was usual:-

S269: 'regali fretus dignitate';

S267: 'Rex istius Provincialis';

S268: 'rex regni regimonia dispensans'.

Reference to the loyalty of a lay beneficiary is also a feature of Beorhtric's charters:-

S269: 'Hemele fidelissimo principi meo';

S267: 'Wigfrutho Praefecto meo dilectissimo lubens admodum largior qui indefessis uiribus in nostra uoluntate diu humiliter et diligenter laborauit';

S268: 'deuoto et cum omni studio in nostro affectu fidelissimo Lullan principi'.

The phrase introducing the land given by the beneficiary in exchange recalls that in another charter relating to an exchange of lands:-

S269: 'pro uice alterius agri';

S1263: 'in uicissitudinem alterius agelluli'.

The king's attestation, which Stenton condemned as anachronistic (1913, p. 29), resembles several others of this time in referring to confirmation with the sign of the cross (S264, 267, 268, etc.), and some of the same words are used in another charter of Beorhtric:-

S269: 'propriis litterarum characteribus roboraui . et singrafa crucis confirmaui';

S268: 'in ius proprium cum auctoritate harum litterarum et cirographorum ast infra caractarum testium tradendo firmiter signo alme crucis donabo et roborabo'.

The indications are that the wording of this charter is entirely authentic.

The witness list similarly appears to be genuine, although it is not entirely explicable. Following Beorhtric's attestation are

those of the two West Saxon bishops, Æthilmod of Sherborne and Cyniberht of Winchester; both were consecrated during Cyniwulf's reign; Æthilmod's last dateable appearance was in 789; Cyniberht was still active in 801 (B250; S1430; S268, 270a). The remaining witnesses are laymen. Hemele, the beneficiary of this charter, had been active since 762, that is for at least 24 years at the time of this transaction (S261-4 and 108). He is described elsewhere as a prefectus and in this document as princeps and patricius, the latter a rather unusual title at so late a date; he was apparently an ealdorman, and it is unlikely that any of these titles was intended to indicate anything more. His presence here is evidence of some continuity of power among noblemen during the reigns of Cyniwulf and Beorhtric. Worr, also an ealdorman, attests Beorhtric's charter of 801 and died the following year, probably in the same battle as Beorhtric (S268; ASC s.a. 802). Beornfrith is otherwise unknown but is given the title prefectus and is likely to have been another of the West Saxon ealdormen. Wigfrith, like Hemele, was a leading man in Cyniwulf's time and continued in power under Beorhtric. His career spanned the two reigns, 757-801, and he is probably to be identified with the thegn who was among the avengers of Cyniwulf in 786 (S96, 149, 261-4, 267-8, 270a; ASC s.a. 757).

The next subscription reads 'Signum manus Lunlinges subreguli'. If this man is a West Saxon, he is otherwise unrecorded unless, as is possible, he is to be identified with the ealdorman Lulla who was the beneficiary of Beorhtric's grant of 801 and attested queen Eadburh's charter in the same year (S268, 270a). Another possible identification is with a Mercian named Lulling who appears in four witness lists of the 790s (S139, 149, 155, 229): amicable contacts between Wessex and Mercia during the reign of Beorhtric are well attested, and it is not implausible that Lulling might have come to the West

Saxon court as a messenger and might have attended a meeting at which his message was discussed and other business was transacted. On any interpretation the title subregulus is extremely odd, as there is no reason to believe that anyone in Wessex or Mercia held this title at so late a date, except for rulers of people such as the Hwicce or South Saxons whose predecessors had been reges but who were now within the Mercian orbit; and such a ruler is unlikely to have attested a West Saxon charter in the middle of a list of laymen. A second attestation by Wigfrith, identical with the first, should probably be regarded as an accidental duplication rather than evidence for another individual of this name. The last witness, Wingbald comes, like Lulling, is unknown if a West Saxon but possibly to be identified with a Mercian: a man with the same title and probably the same name appears in Mercian witness lists of the 790s and of 805 (S229: 'Vibald comes'; S161: 'Wynbald comis'), and might have accompanied Lulling to Wessex.

The variety of titles used in this list is unusual, and not all the people involved can be satisfactorily identified or explained, but nothing in the text looks like the work of a forger and it seems likely that the whole list is genuine. The practice of distinguishing lay and clerical witnesses does not appear here and seems to have gradually died out during the eighth century.

Beorhtric grants to Hemele an estate which is at first described simply as 36 hides. A sentence added at the end of the document states that a portion of this land comprising 26 hides is situated 'iuxta Hissaburnam', a stream name which survives in the modern place-name Hurstbourne in Hampshire. The remaining 10 hides are not identified, and there is no boundary clause or other description of the estate at Hurstbourne. Hemele gives in exchange an area of 34 hides 'iuxta flumen quod appellatur Meonea', that is by the river Meon in Hampshire,

an estate which Hemele has purchased from king Cyniwulf. This land is similarly undefined and cannot be equated with any of the estates at Meon mentioned in other charters. It is possible that the 36 hides at Hurstbourne were part of a larger estate at Hurstbourne Tarrant which was the subject of a dispute in the 10th century. A charter of Æthelred II records that he granted certain estates to Abingdon in compensation for the loss of 3 estates at Hurstbourne, Bedwyn and Burbage which had been granted to the house by Eadgar but seized and restored to royal ownership after his death (S937). The three charters which record Eadgar's grants to Abingdon of Hurstbourne, Bedwyn and Burbage (S688, 689, 756) were defended by Whitelock on the grounds that forgery within about 30 years of the purported dates was scarcely practicable and that formulas from these charters recur in charters of Pershore and Winchester (EHD, introduction to no. 123). However, similar considerations apply to the orthodoxorum series of charters, and Keynes has convincingly argued that most of these are forged (Keynes 1980, pp. 99-100), so there remains a distinct possibility that charters were forged at Abingdon in connection with the dispute over Hurstbourne, Bedwyn and Burbage.

However it scarcely seems possible that Beorhtric's Hurstbourne charter was forged in connection with this dispute as there are so many reasons for considering it to be authentic: its wording has no anachronisms and includes several resemblances to other charters of the time; the witness list could scarcely have been invented; a forger would not have been likely to draw up a charter which recorded an equal exchange of lands, nor would there have been any point in inventing the earlier purchase from Cyniwulf. It also seems improbable that the name of Hurstbourne has been substituted for another place-name, since one would expect that the hidage would be altered to fit:

the charter in Eadgar's name refers to 50 hides, and it is difficult to believe that another charter which begins by mentioning 36 hides and then specifies that only 26 of these are at Hurstbourne, could have been designed at the same time to claim the same estate. Moreover, there is no early charter in the Abingdon archive relating to Bedwyn or Burbage, and if Beorhtric's charter had been forged or altered, one would tend to expect similar forgeries relating to these other estates. The truth about Abingdon's claims to the 3 estates remains obscure, but the probability seems to be that Beorhtric's charter, although it probably came into Abingdon's possession as a title-deed when they acquired Hurstbourne, and may possibly have been used to support Abingdon's claim to the estate, was not drawn up for that purpose, but is a genuine charter of the 8th century.

* * * * *

S268

B.L., Cotton Claudius B vi, fos. 7v-8r.

(Edition: B282)

A second charter of Beorhtric also extant only in Abingdon's later cartulary, records a sale of land to ealdorman Lulla in 801. This presents a very different appearance from that of the earlier document, being much longer and written in a verbose style which contrasts with the simplicity of the grant to Hemele, but there is good reason to argue that the charter is basically genuine and it may be that the whole text is authentic.

The document begins with a long invocation; the dispositio includes a few unnecessarily long phrases, such as the clause relating to the price paid by the beneficiary:-

'quam ex sua propria facultate in pecunia comprobata et beneplacita adquirendo plenissimo precio a nobis comparauit';

the dating clause includes a regnal year, expressed as 'nostri regalis imperii . ab alto caelorum culmine concessi'; and the sanction and blessing are of a length usually associated with tenth-century charters. This verbosity may be the result of some elaboration of the text at a later date, but there is a distinct possibility that it is genuine. None of the clauses has any close parallel in charters of later date or includes any specific phrase characteristic of later writing and not used earlier. Some of the phrases from this document quoted above in the discussion of Beorhtric's earlier charter as resembling those in other charters of the time are among the noticeably wordy passages. And it is in the lengthy sanction that there occurs the references to the placing of the witnesses' names 'in margine istius pagelle', which Stenton noticed as an unusual arrangement which no forger would have invented (Stenton 1955, p. 26). The style of writing used in charters became more expansive during the ninth century, and this charter should probably be seen as an early instance of that process.

The charter is dated 801, the 9th indiction and the 12th regnal year. The last is wrong and should be the 15th: Finberg suggests that xu has been miscopied as xii (ECW, no. 9). The witness list appears to consist of all the leading persons in Wessex at this date, the king and queen, the two bishops, and seven laymen, each with the title princeps, who probably represent the full complement of West Saxon ealdormen. Queen Eadburh appears in other charters including one of which she is the donor and which was issued in the same year as this charter and has a very similar witness list (S270a). The bishops are Cyniberht of Winchester and Wigberht of Sherborne, the latter having succeeded Denefrith some time between 796 and 801. Of the laymen, Worr and Wigfrith are discussed in connection with Beorhtric's earlier charter above; Weohstan was ealdorman of Wiltshire and died

in battle against the Hwicce the following year (ASC s.a. 802); Wiohtbrord and Lulla, the beneficiary, are known only from their appearances in this charter and Eadburh's; Æsc and Ealhmund are otherwise unknown. The list appears to be entirely authentic.

Beorhtric sells to Lulla an estate of 10 hides at 'Eastun', identified as Crux Easton in Hampshire. The estate is defined by means of a long boundary clause in Latin which resembles those in Cyniwulf's last charter and another charter of this reign (S264, 267), and whose authenticity has been convincingly argued on the grounds that the place-name with which it begins and ends was obsolete by the tenth century and could not have been resurrected by a forger (Stenton 1955, p. 26). The estate is said to be free from all earthly services except military service and the building of bridges and this clause is probably genuine since it fits the developments of the reign: Beorhtric's charter of 794 has an immunity excluding only military service, and Eadburh's charter has all three exceptions which later became usual (S267, 270a). Moreover, charters of Ecgberht and Æthelwulf have immunities resembling this one (S273, 298).

Crux Easton is mentioned in only two other pre-Conquest charters, both Abingdon documents. One is a spurious pancarta in the name of Coenwulf of Mercia (S183); the other is the Hurstbourne charter in the name of Eadgar mentioned above whose authenticity is very doubtful (S689). This includes a set of bounds for Crux Easton although the estate is not otherwise mentioned in the text. The bounds are in OE and are shorter than those in Beorhtric's charter, but some of the landmarks are the same, and the same area is probably enclosed. If the charter of Eadgar had any authentic basis, it might be that Hurstbourne Tarrant and Crux Easton were acquired at the same time and recorded in the same charter, the two charters of Beorhtric also

being handed over as title-deeds. But it seems rather more likely that a fabricator at the time of the Hurstbourne dispute referred to the only genuine documentation. Abingdon had for that estate, Beorhtric's charter, and in doing so alighted on the Crux Easton charter and included the bounds of this estate for good measure. In a historically-minded house the two charters of Beorhtric could well have been stored or recorded together: only one charter separates them in the extant cartulary. The evidence is consistent with, and indeed suggests, the theory that Beorhtric's Crux Easton charter is authentic, and the document itself seems genuine, the evidence of the witness list and boundary clause appearing fairly conclusive. The whole charter is probably authentic.

* * * * *

S166

B.L., Cotton Claudius C ix, fos. 106v-107v.

(Edition: B352)

The first of three charters in the name of Coenwulf of Mercia survives only in the earlier cartulary. It relates to two groups of estates of which the first is said to be granted, apparently by the king and the monks of Abingdon jointly, to abbot Hræthun of Abingdon as his own personal property, and the second is described as redeemed by the abbot, by means of a payment in money and lands, from the hands of strangers. The content of this charter with its lists of estates is very dubious, but several features of the text suggest that the extant document is based on an authentic charter of Coenwulf.

The text resembles other charters of this reign in beginning with a dating clause which includes a regnal year (S163, 168, 169, etc.).

The dates are inconsistent, 811 (which was the 15/16th regnal year) and the 19th regnal year (which was 815/6); probably one of the figures has accidentally been miscopied, but nothing in the charter indicates which one. The transaction is said to have taken place at the synod of 'Celichyð', that is Chelsea, and this detail is likely to be genuine as there is evidence that several synods were held there (ASC s.a. 787; S106, 1430; B358). A phrase recording Coenwulf's motive for the transaction has parallels in other late 8th/early 9th century Mercian charters:-

S166: 'non solum pro anime mee sed pro totius gentis Merciorum salute';

S155: 'pro mea perpetua salute et pace ac uictoria amicissimae Merciorum plebis';

S190: 'pro me 7 pro totum gentem Merciorum'.

The charter's references to immunity 'a grauitudine comitum et a durissima seruitute regum' and 'ab omni seruitute magno uel modico regum . principum . episcoporum' similarly resemble provisions in other charters of the time (S168, 186, 180), and there are parallels for the granting of an immunity without exceptions (S165, 169, 187).

The witness list consists of only two names, Coenwulf and Wulfred, archbishop of Canterbury (805-832). These are quite acceptable as an abbreviated synodal witness list and fit any of the possible dates of the charter. This document constitutes the only evidence that Hræthun was abbot of Abingdon (Hræthun's career is discussed by Stenton 1913, pp. 27-8). According to Abingdon tradition, he was a bishop in Mercia until driven from his see, when he took refuge at Abingdon and eventually became abbot there. In fact his career seems to have taken a more conventional form. He was an abbot in 814, and by 816 had been consecrated as bishop of Leicester, in which capacity he continued to act for many years (S173, 177; Page 1966, p. 5; Richter

1973, no. 10; S180, 1438, etc.). The fact that extant records of eighth- and ninth-century Abingdon are predominantly Mercian renders it quite possible that an abbot of this house was appointed to a Mercian see, and the chronology of Hræthun's career is consistent with his appearance as abbot in this charter. His name may well therefore be an authentic feature of the text, although some doubt necessarily remains: his name could have been borrowed from a commemorative record, and the phrase 'pro eius amabili pecunia ac deuotione quam erga nos gerebat' is of a type commonly found in grants to laymen.

The estates named in this charter are listed in the table below:-

<u>First Group</u>	<u>Modern Name</u>	<u>Hides</u>	<u>County</u>
Ebbanduna	Abingdon	310	Berkshire
Wyrðe	Longworth	10	"
Aclea	Oakley	} 18	?
Norðtuna	Norton		?
Punningstoce	-		?
<u>Second Group</u>			
Sunningwellan	Sunningwell	15	Berkshire
Eatune	Eaton	10	"
Sandforda	Dry Sandford	10	"
Denceswyrðe	Denchworth	} 30	"
Goseie	Goosey		"
Culanham	Culham		Oxfordshire
Gaingē	Ginge	10	Berkshire
Lechamstede	Leckhamstead	10	"

Of the first group Oakley, Norton and Punningstoce do not recur in Abingdon records and none of these three can be satisfactorily identified, the place-names Oakley and Norton recurring in several counties. Longworth was granted by Eadwig to a layman in 958 in a charter extant in the Abingdon archive; it is also named in two spurious confirmatory charters of Abingdon relating to various estates, and was owned by the monastery in 1066 (S654; S567, 673; DB Berkshire, p. 7.39).

All of the second group (but none of the first) also appear in another dubious pancarta in Coenwulf's name (S183), and three of them, Goosey, Culham and Ginge, also occur in other spurious charters claiming these estates for Abingdon (Goosey: S567, 673; Culham: S184; Ginge: S93, 567, 673). Denchworth, Culham and Leckhamstead were in lay hands in the tenth century (Denchworth: S529, 657, 687; Culham: S460; Leckhamstead: S491, 665, 1404), and Denchworth and Ginge are the subjects of tenth-century grants to Abingdon (Denchworth: S733; Ginge: S583). Sunningwell, Dry Sandford, Ginge and Leckhamstead were included in Abingdon's Domesday endowment (DB Berkshire, pp. 7.11, 7.9, 7.45, 46, 7.14).

It is scarcely possible that this charter is genuine as it stands. There is no authentic instance of a pancarta of the early ninth century, and the probability is that a genuine charter of Coenwulf, which may or may not have originally related to Abingdon, has been adapted at a later date to create a record of estates which the monastery was believed to own or which it wished to claim. Such charters as this may have been drawn up in connection with efforts to re-establish the house and recover its properties in the tenth century.

* * * * *

S184

Dugdale 1817, p. 514, no. 7.

A charter in the name of Coenwulf of Mercia recording a grant of land at Culham in Oxfordshire to Abingdon was not included by either of the cartularists but survives in an inspeximus copy in the Charter and Patent Rolls and is also transcribed in a fourteenth-century manuscript, Chatsworth 71 E. The document seems to be a fabrication.

Much of the wording appears to have been drafted in the tenth century. The land is described as 'quandam ruris mei portionem, id est, quindecim mansas in loco qui a ruricolis nuncupatur Cullanhamme'; the words rus, mansa and nuncupare are all characteristic of tenth-century writing. The estate is granted 'cum omnibus utilitatibus ad eam pertinentibus, tam in magnis quam in modicis rebus'; the last phrase is very common in tenth-century charters, and utilitatibus also seems to be a tenth-century usage (S619, 638, etc.; S622). The list of the components of the estate is unusual in including 'derivativis-que cursibus aquarum', a phrase which recurs in a charter of Eadgar (S715). The immunity begins 'Sit autem prædictum jus liberum ab omni regali obstaculo ...', a wording common in tenth-century charters (S619, 604, 715, etc.). The sanction is duplicated almost word for word in charters of Eadgar extant at Abingdon and elsewhere (S701, 717, 718, etc.). The dating clause begins 'Karaxata est autem cartula ...' which is a wording used regularly in tenth-century charters.

Other sections of the text, while not identifiable stylistically as the writing of a later age, are revealed as spurious by their content. Coenwulf is said to make the grant at the request of his sisters 'Keneswyth et Burgevilde' who chose to be buried at the monastery of Abingdon. This sentence is evidently connected with a story told in the narrative

of the chronicle-cartulary: Coenwulf's sisters (who are not named here) decided, with his permission, to remain unmarried in order to serve God, and Coenwulf gave them Culham with reversion to Abingdon where they were to be buried, the estate being subject to the abbot of Abingdon and free from all other authority (Stevenson, Abingdon Chron., Vol. 1, pp. 18-20). It is possible that this story originated in a genuine charter of Coenwulf, not now extant, granting land to women named Cyneswith and Burhhild, who may have been his sisters, but the reference in the present charter was probably added by a writer of later date who knew the story, or a version of it, and used it to provide some local colour. Members of Coenwulf's family are in fact more likely to have been buried at Winchcombe. The land is said to be free not only from the exactions of kings and their ministri but also from those of bishops and their officiales, and its inhabitants are to be subject to no-one but the abbot of Abingdon. This differs noticeably from the usual content of immunities in charters of Coenwulf, and its emphasis on the abbot's authority, which is also a feature of the chronicle-cartulary's narrative of Coenwulf's sisters, tends to suggest the preoccupations of a later age.

The charter is dated inconsistently 821 (that is the 25th or 26th regnal year) and 11th regnal year (that is 806/7). Miscopying of either figure seems unlikely as the discrepancies are so large, and one of them may have been miscalculated by a writer of later date. Some of the witnesses could not appear in an authentic charter of Coenwulf's name. Cyniberht, bishop of Winchester, died not later than 803 (8312, attested by his successor); Oda was bishop of Ramsbury in the tenth century (Page 1966, pp. 14, 24; S407, etc.); Worr, bishop of Lichfield, died in 737 (Historia Regum s.a. 737); two other witnesses, 'Wyothrican primicer(ius)' and 'Willap not(arius)' appear to have been borrowed

from a papal document as these titles were used in the papal chancery but not in England (Except that the report of the Council of Hertford in 672 was written by 'Titillo notario': HE IV 5).

The other four names are quite acceptable in a charter of Coenwulf: the king himself; queen Ælfthryth ('Eldreda'); the king's son, Cynehelm ('Kenelmus'); and bishop Wigberht of Sherborne. Moreover, while the names of Coenwulf and Wigberht might have been borrowed from narrative sources, and Cynehelm could well be known to a writer of later date because of the cult of 'St. Kenelm', the name of Ælfthryth almost certainly originated in a charter of Coenwulf's reign. This, however, is the only detail in the extant text of which this can be said. A few clauses, such as the invocation and the reference to the consent of witnesses, consist of standard formulas which continued in use over a long period of time and could therefore have been employed equally by a writer of Coenwulf's time or a forger. But no feature other than the queen's name can be described as peculiar to, or characteristic of, the early ninth century, and the anachronisms and oddities detailed above account for most of the text. Furthermore, the fact that the identifiably tenth-century portions of the charter include the account of the estate strongly suggests that the author did not begin with a grant by Coenwulf of this land, since he would then presumably have copied out the text before him, at least in part, rather than deliberately obliterate every word of it by re-writing. The other charter in Coenwulf's name discussed above appears to be based on an authentic charter, and the name of the queen may have been borrowed from that document. The present charter, however, appears to be a fabrication.

The estate at Culham is named in both the spurious pancartae in the name of Coenwulf and is also the subject of a grant by king Eadmund to his kinswoman Ælfhild in 940, now surviving in the Abingdon cartulary

(Sl66, 183, 460). Culham is not named in Domesday Book, and it is not certain whether Abingdon acquired the land with the charter or whether the latter was deposited by a lay person for safekeeping. Nor is anything known of the history of the estate before Eadmund's grant. The charter in Coenwulf's name suggests that Abingdon wished to establish a claim to the estate in the tenth century or later, but the document provides no evidence for the ninth century.

* * * * *

Sl83

B.L., Cotton Claudius B vi, fos. 9v-10r.

(Edition: B366)

A general grant of privileges to Abingdon incorporating a long list of estates owned by the house survives in both cartularies. The document appears to be spurious as it stands although based on an authentic charter of Coenwulf.

The dating clause is placed at the beginning of the document immediately after the invocation and includes an indiction (13th) as well as an incarnational year, while a regnal year (25th) is mentioned at the beginning of the dispositio. All three are consistent and date the document to the last year of Coenwulf's reign, 821. The spelling of the king's name in the dispositio, 'Coenulfus', suggests an early exemplar. The opening clauses of the text therefore have every appearance of authenticity. Another section of the extant text similarly appears to derive from a genuine charter of the reign: the wording of the immunity resembles that in authentic charters of Coenwulf's successors, including one document which dates from the following year:-

- S183: '... nec rex suum pastum requirat uel habentes homines quos nos dicimus festigmen nec eos qui accipitres portant uel falcones uel caballos ducunt siue canes';
- S186: 'liberabo ab omni servitute secularium rerum a pastu regis episcopis principum seu prefectum exactorum ducorum canorum vel equorum seu accipitrum ab refectione et habitu illorum omnium qui dicuntur fæstingmen';
- S190: 'liberabo a pastu regis 7 principum 7 ab omni constructione regalis ville et a difficultate illa quam nos saxonice faestingmenn dicimus';
- S207: 'liberam a pastu omnium accipitrum et falconum ...'.

Other parts of the charter, however, appear dubious. Coenwulf is said to grant privileges to Abingdon at the request of pope Leo and bishop Hræthun. There had been correspondence between Coenwulf and pope Leo III earlier in the reign regarding the abolition of the archiepiscopal see of Lichfield and other matters, and Leo issued privileges for monasteries with which Coenwulf was connected (See the discussion of DA, pp. 108-10). It was believed at Abingdon in the late tenth century that Coenwulf, Leo and Hræthun were all involved in the securing of privileges for Abingdon (S876; Stenton 1913, p. 8). But the transaction reported in this charter seems to be based on knowledge or traditions of this background, and not on actual events: pope Leo died in 816 and could not therefore be actively involved in a contract of 821; nor is it likely that the pope would have requested the king to grant privileges - the request would have been made by the king to the pope. Hræthun was certainly living at this time, but it is not very likely that he would have been acting on behalf of a community of which he was no longer a member and would actually have been cited as joint beneficiary:-

'Rethunum uenerabilem episcopum ut sibimet uel suis propinquis seu ipsa familia que habitat in monasterio que sita est in Abbandune'.

Bishops are not elsewhere cited in authentic early charters as if still effectively heads of the houses they had ruled as abbots.

The immunity is said to apply to all the estates owned by the monastery,

'cum rebus mobilibus et immobilibus in notis causis et ignotis in modicis et in magnis'.

In authentic charters of this period such phrases were usually used, not of property, but of the obligations from which immunities were granted:-

S173: 'liberabo predictam terram a notis causis 7 ignotis a magnis vel modicis';

S180: 'servitutibus modicis et magnis, notis ignotis';

S190: 'liberamus a modicis et a magnis causis a notis et ignotis'.

The wording of this charter therefore seems suspect, perhaps ineptly adapted from a genuine charter.

Exceptions from the immunity are stated in unusual terms, and the obligation of military service is restricted to 'Expeditionem cum . xii . uasallis et cum tantis scutis'. Brooks has put forward a tentative defense of this provision on the grounds that it suggests a primitive army and is more likely to be the work of a pre-Conquest than a 12th-century forger (cited in ECTV, no. 18). Moreover, there is a similar provision in another document of this reign: an endorsement added to a charter of Offa (S106) in 801 refers to an obligation of military service which is limited to 5 men (Gillingham 1981, p. 62). This detail may therefore be genuine. But much of the wording of this charter does not resemble that of authentic charters of the period, and appears more likely to represent the work of a forger. There is no witness list.

25 estates are named in this charter as the property of Abingdon in 821. Of these 15 were in the possession of the monastery in the tenth and/or eleventh century, and 11 of the 15 can be shown to have come into Abingdon's possession in the tenth or eleventh century. Charney, Watchfield, Leckhamstead, Boxford and Welford are the subjects of tenth-

<u>Estate</u>	<u>Modern Name</u>
Culanhom	Culham, Oxfordshire
Chenigtun	Kennington
Hengesteseig	Hinksey
Cumanora	Cumnor
Earmundelæh	(?) Bessels Leigh
Eatun	Eaton
Suniggapelle	Sunningwell
Sondford	Dry Sandford
ƿudtun	Wootton
Gæging	Ginge
Deincesƿurƿ	Denchworth
Ceornei	Charney
Goeseg	Goosey
Færhom	Fernham
ƿæthenesfeld	Watchfield
Scriuenanhom	Shrivenham
Burgtuum	Bourton
Læhhamstede	Leckhamstead
Boxora	Boxford
ƿælingford	Welford
Wicham	Wickham
Spene	Speen
ƿohanlæh	Poughley
Trindlæh	-
Eastun	Crux Easton, Hampshire
The estates are in Berkshire unless otherwise stated	

century grants to lay beneficiaries recorded in charters surviving in the Abingdon archive and were owned by Abingdon in 1066 (S651; S413; S491; S577, 687, 761; S552, 622. DB Berkshire, pp. 7.40, 36, 14, 13); the records of grants to laymen were probably acquired with the estates. Kennington, Cumnor, Ginge, Denchworth, Crux Easton and Hinksey were all granted to Abingdon itself during the tenth century, and the first three were still owned in 1066 (S1292, 757, 583, 733, 689, 663. DB Berkshire, pp. 7.11, 1, 4, 45). Sunningwell, Dry Sandford, Goosey and Bessels Leigh were all Abingdon properties in 1066, but the dates when these were acquired are unknown (DB Berkshire, pp. 7.11, 9, 23, 20). The remaining 10 estates cannot be shown to have been the property of Abingdon at any time. None of them was owned by Abingdon in 1066 or 1086. Fernham, Shrivenham, Bourton, Wickham, Speen, Poughley and Trindlæh appear in no other pre-Conquest charter. Eaton occurs in only one other charter, the other pancarta in the name of Coenwulf discussed above; and Culham and Wootton were granted to lay beneficiaries in tenth-century charters which survive in the Abingdon archive, but may simply have been deposited there for safe-keeping (S460, 858).

It is unlikely that Abingdon would have attempted at any time after 1086 to lay claim to so many estates which did not appear as part of the monastery's endowment in Domesday Book, and this charter, therefore, was probably drawn up in its present form at some earlier date. It is not, however, probable that it was written as early as the ninth century. There is no authentic example of a comparable pancarta at such an early date, and the lands listed here seem to relate to the monastery's endowment as it stood in the tenth century. It is not impossible that some of the estates acquired in the tenth and eleventh centuries had actually been owned by Abingdon in earlier years and alienated in the days of the monastery's decline, but it is scarcely credible that

of 25 estates purporting to represent Abingdon's early ninth-century endowment, 15 should have been recovered a century or more later after passing through royal, and in many cases also lay, hands, and should all have the same names in 821 as they did in later centuries.

This charter seems to be spurious as it stands, and the transaction it purports to record, a general grant of privileges for all the estates owned by Abingdon in 821, is almost certainly imaginary. The author does seem to have based his work on an authentic charter of Coenwulf, but the original content of that charter is now unknown. It may have been a grant of immunity, as Brooks suggests (ECTV, no. 18), or may have been a grant of land to Abingdon or some other beneficiary.

* * * * *

S278

B.L., Cotton Claudius B vi, fos. 11v-12v.

(Edition: B413)

A charter in the name of Ecgberht of Wessex recording a grant of property and privileges to Abingdon is certainly spurious as it stands, and seems unlikely to have any authentic basis, although a few details in it may derive from an authentic charter.

Some parts of the text are duplicated almost word for word in the second pancarta in the name of Coenwulf discussed above (S183). The invocation is the same and the dating clause is worded in the same way although the actual dates are different. A regnal year is given in the dispositio, the same phrase being used, 'anno imperii nostri'. The immunity is duplicated in the passage which begins 'Et sic mandamus ...' and ends '... cum simplo precio componat', and the sanction also agrees word for word. This charter is dated 835, 14 years later than

the date given in the charter of Coenwulf. It cannot be said to be impossible that someone drawing up a charter in 835 used a charter of 821 as a model, but evidence for this sort of practice at this date is lacking, and it seems more likely that a writer of much later date has borrowed these clauses from one charter while fabricating the other. Parallels for these clauses occur, as detailed above, in Mercian charters, which tends to suggest that they originated in a charter of Coenwulf. But, if Abingdon were a Mercian monastery at this date as the evidence tends to suggest, a charter of Ecgberht written there would probably reflect Mercian practice, just as ninth-century charters written in Kent follow the traditions of Kentish diplomatic, irrespective of whether the donors were Kentish, Mercian or West Saxon (Brooks 1984, pp. 327-330). It is therefore impossible to be certain where these clauses originated.

Following the duplicated immunity are several more clauses detailing obligations from which the beneficiary is to be immune and setting out how the profits of justice are to be distributed. There is no parallel for this passage in any genuine early charter, and it appears to be entirely spurious. Stenton argued that the passage was the work of a post-Conquest writer on the grounds that the phrase '*Pretium quoque sanguinis peregrinorum id est wergeld*' must have been written by someone acquainted with the Norman concept of murder (Stenton 1913, p. 30). But it seems possible that the reference is based on Anglo-Saxon law: the laws of Ine, for example, provide for the division of the wergild of a foreigner who is slain between the king and another interested party, who might be an abbot or abbess (Laws of Ine, 23, 23.1, 23.2: Attenborough, Laws, p. 42). The document may therefore have been drawn up in its present form before the Conquest, although it can scarcely date from the reign of Ecgberht.

A few features of the charter could be authentic and suggest the possibility that the compiler made use of a genuine charter of Ecgberht; but none of these can be said to establish the use of such a charter beyond doubt. All the statements of date are consistent and indicate 835. The grant is said to have been made at Dorchester at Easter and confirmed at Christmas, which is not a likely invention, and resembles a dating clause of Ecgberht's reign preserved at Winchester, which records the completion of a contract in two stages, 19th August and 26th December (S272, 273).

The witness list appears to be substantially genuine and fits this date. The witnesses are Ecgberht himself; Æthelwulf, described as 'filius regis'; bishops Ealhstan of Sherborne, Hræthun of Leicester and Cynered of Selsey; abbots Wulflaf and Eadwald who are otherwise unknown; and ealdormen Wulfheard who died in 840, Osmod who died in 836, and Wigfrith who was active from 757 onwards (ASC s.a. 840, 836; S96), and who, alone of these witnesses, could not appear in a charter of this date, unless another Wigfrith, otherwise unrecorded, is meant. The rest of the list appears to be authentic. A forger could have borrowed many of these names from the Chronicle; bishop Hræthun was known to Abingdon tradition; and the two abbots might have been taken from a charter of some other period. But bishop Cynered appears in no narrative source, and was certainly active at this date: he was consecrated not later than 824 and was at the synod æt Astran in 839 (S1434, 1438). His name therefore strongly suggests that the list is substantially genuine and derives from an authentic charter of c. 835. This may have been a charter of Ecgberht, but there are other possibilities, for example that the compiler adapted a synodal witness list, or that the witness list was appended to a Mercian charter to record Ecgberht's confirmation of an earlier transaction.

The dispositio records that Ecgberht grants 'monasterium illud Mercham quinquaginta manentium ad Abbendune'. If the author's intention were to describe Marcham, Berkshire, as a monastery, this would be a point in favour of the charter, as it is not recorded as such elsewhere and such a detail is not likely to have been invented. But the Latin is not clear, and it may be that the phrase was intended to refer to Abingdon. All that is known for certain about the early history of Marcham is that it was granted to Abingdon by Eadgar in 965 and was still owned by the monastery in 1066 (S734; DB Berkshire, p. 7.17).

The story of a grant by Ecgberht to Abingdon recurs in a spurious charter in the Winchester cartulary (S358). This document incorporates a narrative stating that Ecgberht purchased 50 hides at Hurstbourne (Hampshire) from bishop Hræthun (MS 'Aðelred uno episcopo' for 'a Rethuno episcopo'; Finberg 1964, p. 134) and his familia at Abingdon, and gave in exchange 50 hides at Mercham; Ecgberht bequeathed Hurstbourne to Æthelwulf, and he left it to Ælfred for life with reversion to Winchester; Edward the Elder is now said to confirm Winchester's ownership. Another spurious Winchester charter provides a rather different account of the earlier history of the estate at Hurstbourne, but agrees with the first in asserting that Winchester acquired the land from Ælfred (S354). It appears that the purpose of these two charters was to strengthen Winchester's claim to Hurstbourne, probably Hurstbourne Priors which the community did acquire from Ælfred and which they still held in 1066 (S1507; DB Hampshire, p. 3.6).

The narrative of the first charter also seems designed to establish that Abingdon did not have a claim to the land, which tends to suggest that some claim on Abingdon's part had been made. Abingdon acquired Hurstbourne Tarrant from Eadgar in 961, and held it until c. 975 when it was taken back into royal possession (S689, 937). Both Hurstbournes

appear in pre-Conquest documents simply as 'Hissaburna', and it may be that some confusion had arisen as to who owned what. The author of the first Winchester charter, who cited bishop Hræthun as the head of the Abingdon community was evidently acquainted with inaccurate Abingdon traditions concerning this man. And close contacts between Abingdon and Winchester can reasonably be postulated during just the period when Abingdon owned Hurstbourne Tarrant, since at that time the community of the newly reformed Old Minster consisted of monks from Abingdon (Winterbottom, Three Saints, p. 44). It seems possible that Abingdon's acquisition of Marcham in 965 was connected with the settlement of a dispute with Winchester concerning Hurstbourne, Abingdon perhaps receiving Marcham in consideration of giving up any claim to Hurstbourne Priors. Unfortunately the evidence provides no clear information about the earlier history of Marcham, but it tends to suggest that the alleged grant of Ecgberht was designed to support a later claim, just as Winchester's spurious Hurstbourne charters seem to have been. A grant by Ecgberht to Abingdon is not impossible: such a grant might have been made during the brief period of Ecgberht's military successes against Mercia. But this charter can scarcely be cited as evidence for Ecgberht's reign.

(c) Conclusions

What purports to be the oldest extant Abingdon charter, the fragment in the name of Ceadwalla, appears to be wholly spurious and may be disregarded. The remaining charters relating to the period down to 839 fall into three distinct groups. Firstly charters of the late seventh or early eighth century, some of them spurious, which represent the documentation of a monastery at Bradfield in Berkshire, some 15

miles from Abingdon. Secondly, two charters recording grants by Beorhtric of Wessex to laymen, which are evidence for the history of Wessex and the development of charter-writing in that reign, but have nothing to do with Abingdon in this period. And finally four charters of the early ninth century, all spurious as they stand, but all purporting to relate to Abingdon itself and representing the house as a Mercian establishment.

The evidence of the first group of charters establishes that Hæha, a West Saxon nobleman contemporary with Ine and possibly a kinsman of the king, established a monastery on an estate of 45 hides comprising Bradfield, Basildon and Streatley in Berkshire, and later known simply as Bradfield. The land was given initially by the obscure Eadfrith, son of Iddi, but later restored or confirmed by Ine. Hæha became abbot of his new foundation, which may have been a family monastery as his sister, Ceolswith, apparently a laywoman, was joint owner of the estate. The monastery was founded some time between 688 and 704, and there is some reason to believe that it received further grants of land from Coenred, the father of Ine, and from king Æthilred of Mercia, and possibly also from Æthilbald of Mercia. Situated near the border, it may well have received patronage from both kingdoms, as the early Malmesbury did. There is no evidence for the existence of the house later than the early eighth century, although it is, of course, quite possible that it survived for many more years.

Members of the Abingdon community, attempting at much later dates to write the history of their house, assumed that the Bradfield documentation related to Abingdon itself, and represented Hæha as Abingdon's founder. The fact that they did so suggests that the documentation was the earliest they possessed, and that there were no charters of this period relating to Abingdon. There is no evidence for a monastery at Abingdon

as early as the seventh or eighth century.

The four charters dated to the early ninth century appear to be based on one or more authentic Mercian charters of this period. Because of the dubious nature of the extant texts, any conclusions based on them can only be regarded as possibilities. The charters do not establish any certainties, but they suggest that the monastery at Abingdon was founded not later than 816, that Hræthun, later bishop of Leicester, was abbot of the house, and that it was a Mercian establishment. This is consistent with other evidence for the area in this period. In 779 Offa captured Bensington from Cyniwulf of Wessex, and he also annexed Cookham and many other towns, probably at much the same time (ASC s.a. 779; S1258). A charter of 844 indicates that king Berhtwulf of Mercia controlled Berkshire at that date (S1271), and the shire was probably part of Mercia throughout the first half of the ninth century, except during Ecgberht's brief conquest of Mercia. If the monastery existed before the period of Offa's victories against Cyniwulf, it was probably a West Saxon foundation which later became a Mercian house, following the change of power in the area. But there is no evidence for such earlier existence, and the house may have been founded by Mercians in the late eighth or early ninth century. The only absolutely incontrovertible evidence for its existence before the time of Æthelwold is Ælfric's description of the 'monasterium ... neglectum ac destitutum' (Winterbottom, Three Saints, p. 40) on the site at Abingdon where the house was refounded.

5. MUCHELNEY

	<u>Page</u>
a) Introduction	316
b) <u>The Charters</u>	316
<u>S</u>	
240 Ine, king, to Froda, abbot	317
244 Ine, king, to Beaga, monk	322
1176 Bealthun to Froda, abbot	325
249 Ine, king, to Froda, abbot and Muchelney	326
261 Cyniwulf, king, to Eadwald, abbot, and Muchelney .	329
c) <u>Conclusions</u>	331

(a) Introduction

The pre-Conquest charters of the Somerset monastery of Muchelney survive in a cartulary of the late thirteenth century (Davis 1958, no. 685), and the latest of them, a charter of Æthelred II dated 995 (S884), also survives as an original. The cartulary and the single-sheet charter of Æthelred came to light at Savernake Park towards the end of the last century, and the charters were edited in 1899 for the Somerset Record Society by the Rev. E.H. Bates, who dealt with all post-Conquest documents, and Mr. W.H. Stevenson, who was responsible for the 9 pre-Conquest texts (Bates, Muchelney Cart.). The cartulary was purchased several years ago by the British Library where it is now Additional Manuscript 56488. The single-sheet charter of Æthelred is in the Somerset Record Office at Taunton.

The main text of the cartulary, beginning with 7 of the pre-Conquest charters and ending with documents relating to the Assize of 1280, is written by a single scribe in a clear book-hand with rubrics added in red. Two further early charters are added at the end of the manuscript by a different scribe (S244, 1176), and there are some other miscellaneous additions. The medieval binding survives, but some gatherings are partly detached from it, and the cartulary is at present classified by the British Library as an unbound manuscript. The text of Æthelred's charter does not differ significantly in the cartulary version (Bates, Muchelney Cart., p. 45 n. 1), so it appears that the cartularist copied his exemplars with reasonable accuracy.

(b) The Charters

The Muchelney charters relating to the period down to 839 are listed below.

<u>S</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Donor</u>	<u>Beneficiary</u>
240	693	Ine, king	Froda, abbot
244	702	Ine, king	Beaga, monk
1176	708	Bealthun	Froda, abbot
249	725	Ine, king	Froda, abbot, and Muchelney
261	762	Cyniwulf, king	Eadwald, abbot, and Muchelney

S240

B.L., Additional 56488, fos. 5v-6r.

(Edition: Bates, Muchelney Cart., no. 5)

This curious document is not simply a charter but is a later account of a charter in which the text is quoted after some introductory material. It seems likely that the author of this composite document did have an authentic early charter before him, and that a substantial part of the text he presents is authentic.

The document begins with a passage resembling a proem which asserts the need for written records, and then deduces from this that it is necessary, 'gubernante domino atque iubente pontifice nostro Peodi', to confirm the grant made by king Ine, 'rogante patricio suo Usibuco precioque dato', to abbot Froda of 40 hides of land. There follows a rubric introducing the quoted text of the charter; the latter is dated 693.

The author makes no claim that any part of the introductory passage actually forms part of Ine's charter, and much of it is clearly work of a later date. The 'proem' is unlike the literacy proem common among the earliest charters, and of course much of the content could not have originated in a charter. But the author's brief summary of the transaction may well preserve some of the wording as well as the content of a charter of Ine. The name of the patricius is blundered

and it is impossible to deduce what name the surviving form is based on, but the reference to his request is probably genuine as there is a parallel in another seventh-century charter:-

S240: 'rogante patricio sui Usibuco';

S71: 'rogatus a patricio meo et propinquo meo Cenfritho'.

The title patricius is used by other early writers (e.g. S252; Ehwald, p. 503), but apparently fell out of use by the ninth century (Stenton 1913, p. 12; Thacker 1981, p. 220). The reference to a price being paid is unusual in an early West Saxon context, but there are parallels in early charters from eastern England (S9, 1785). Abbot Froda's name could have been borrowed from another charter in the Muchelney archive (S1176), but could well be genuine; he is recorded as abbot in 704 and 708 (S245, 1176), and it is quite plausible that he should have been appointed by 693. The description of the estate is precisely what could be expected in an early charter: 'id est aliquam partem terre in quadraginta casatos'.

Another detail which might derive from Ine's charter is the name of the bishop, 'Peodi'. The text actually connects him with the later confirmation, not the original transaction, but the author probably did not intend that the confirmation should appear to date from his own time, which may well have been hundreds of years after the date of Ine's charter, and he would scarcely have produced this blundered name form if his intention was to refer to a bishop who was a contemporary of his own. The name could well derive from a subscription or reference to episcopal consent in Ine's charter. Stevenson suggested that the name was meant for Theodore (Bates, Muchelney Cart., p. 46 n. 1), but it seems more likely that it was Hæddi: capital letters are often difficult to read in an unfamiliar hand; an archaic half-uncial capital H could look very like a thorn; and it is likely that Hæddi

would have been named in a charter of Ine dating from 693.

The text which is presented as the actual wording of Ine's charter appears to be largely genuine. It begins by addressing the beneficiary in the second person, 'Ego tibi hanc terram donans impendo'. This usage was confined outside Kent to a small group of very early charters (see S235) and is more likely to be an authentic feature of a seventh-century charter than a forger's invention. The reference to the love of eternal life is similar to phrases in two other early charters:-

S240: 'pro uite eterne amore';

S236: 'ob amorem celestis patrie';

S1787: 'pro spe remunerationis æternæ';

'pro amore omnipotentis dei'.

The clause relating to the beneficiary's rights over the property also has similarities to clauses in other early charters surviving in the Muchelney archive and elsewhere, and all these clauses appear to derive ultimately from a formula used in Gregory's grant of 587 (Hartmann, Gregory, p. 437):-

S240: 'ut subiecta sit dominio gubernacionis tue et subdita iuxta morem priuilegii atque possessio monachorum iure perpetuo';

Gregory: 'habeat, teneat, possideat, iure dominioque suo';

S1168: 'ut habeas . teneas . iure dominio . tam tuo quam monasterii tui';

S244: 'et ad eum iure sect [sic, for suo or perpetuo?] pertinet';

'habeat ipse in dn'eo [sic, for dominio?] potestates proprie';

S65: 'in dominio supra dicti Episcopi possidendum perpetuale jure tradidimus';

S1176: 'habeat in proprio dominio'.

There follows a brief sanction in the form of a prohibitive clause, providing that the donor's successors shall not infringe the grant; prohibitive clauses occur in several early charters (S231, 235, 1249, etc.). A more detailed account of the situation of the land is then

provided, the estate being defined by means of adjacent geographical features, a river, a street and a wood. The estate itself is given no name, and the whole description is just what might be expected in a seventh-century charter. The land is said to extend 'usque ad fines quos antiquitus priscis temporibus priores nostri designando fixerunt'. This may represent the thought of the later compiler, or it might be genuine; it is not unlike the references in early Kentish charters to 'notissimos terminos' (S8, 19). The date is given as 693, 6th indiction, 3rd of the Kalends of January, i.e. 30th December. The dates are consistent and suit a charter of Ine involving bishop Hæddi. The incarnational date has probably been added to the text at some later time, but it seems to be correct. A further sanction in the form of a penal clause is added after the date; its position makes it look like an afterthought. No witness list is preserved. Very little of the wording of the charter is unacceptable as seventh-century work.

The description of the estate explains that the total of 40 hides consists of two pieces of land; one, of 37 hides, is situated 'in plaga orientali a ripa fluminis Yle et ex utraque parte uie publice'; the remaining 3 hides are 'in parte occidentali fluminis Yle cum silua que dicitur Stretmerch'. Finberg suggested that this estate was Isle Abbots, and mentioned in support of this theory that the parish included a detached area of woodland, the Stretmerch of the text (ECW, no. 365). Other considerations, however, operate against this identification. The modern village of Isle Abbots lies to the west of the river Isle, as did the whole of an estate of 10 hides at Isle Abbots which was granted to a layman by Eadgar in 966 and defined in the relevant charter by detailed bounds (S740; defended by Stenton 1955, pp. 15-16). It seems unlikely that the estate of Isle Abbots could ever have consisted

of 37 hides east of the river and only 3 to the west.

The uia publica of the charter is probably the Fosse Way of which a section runs very roughly parallel to the Isle, at one point within about 4 miles of the river. It is impossible to pinpoint an area of land which lies east of the river Isle and on either side of the Fosse Way: a substantial tract of country could be described in these terms. One possible identification is with Ilminster, an estate which was the subject of a dispute between Muchelney and lay claimants in the tenth century (S884) and was owned by the monastery in 1066 (DB Somerset, p. 9.3). The 20-hide estate owned in later years did not extend as far east as the Fosse Way (Grundy 1935, pp. 138-42), but a 40-hide estate owned earlier might have done so. If the estate were Ilminster, the extant 'confirmation' of Ine's grant might have been produced to support Muchelney's claim at the time of the dispute (although the absence of any explicit reference to Ilminster renders this doubtful), before a more sophisticated forgery was drawn up, apparently with Glastonbury's help (S249, discussed below). But this is only one possibility. The estate could well have been elsewhere, and another possible explanation for the introductory passage added to the copy of this charter is that the original was damaged and partly illegible, so that the copyist supplemented the text with some clauses of his own. It does, however, appear likely that much of the extant text is a transcript of an authentic charter of Ine, the earliest to survive in the Muchelney archive.

* * * * *

B.L., Additional 56488, fo. 63r.

(Edition: Bates, Muchelney Cart., no. 106)

A charter in the name of king Ine is one of two early Anglo-Saxon charters added at the end of the cartulary by another scribe. The first scribe may have considered the property granted in these two documents too insignificant to justify their inclusion: one relates to a fishery (S1176), the other to a single hide of land plus a fishery (S244). It appears likely that both are substantially genuine.

Ine's grant is said to have been made to 'fratri Begano'. Old English personal names ending in -a were sometimes Latinised as -anus, and 'Begano' is probably derived from a personal name, Beaga (Stevenson in Bates, Muchelney Cart., p. 96 n. 1). The name does not occur in uncompounded form elsewhere, but the same name or a feminine form of it appears to be the first element of the place-name 'Beaganhangan', now Binegar in Somerset (Hearne, John of Glastonbury, p. 373; Ekwall 1960, p. 44). The obscurity of the beneficiary is a point in favour of the charter.

The text is headed by a curious rubric. The scribe appears first to have written 'Libertas aht'; he then erased 'aht' and wrote above the erasure 'ahtbegonis possessio'. Stevenson pointed out that this rubric appears to derive from an Old English endorsement which the scribe failed to understand: 'aht' means possession or property, and 'begonis' is no doubt a blundered form of the beneficiary's name (Bates, Muchelney Cart., p. 96 n. 1). The rubric resembles the sort of endorsement found on the verso of a single-sheet charter, rather than a cartularist's heading, and suggests that the charter was copied from a single sheet.

Most of the wording of the charter appears to be genuine, but the text is corrupt in places. The proem is a version of one which

asserts the need for written records and is fairly common among early charters (S65, 1164, 1169, etc.). The king's title appears as 'Saxonorum regnum' (sic), presumably a miscopying of 'Saxonum rex'; the unusual form 'Saxanorum' occurs elsewhere in this cartulary in the work of both the first scribe (S240) and this one (S1176), and it may be that the practice of the first scribe influenced that of the second. The land is described as 'aliquam terre in loco qui dicitur Athom unam mansam'. One would tend to expect 'aliquam terre portionem' (or partem) and 'id est unam ...', but it is possible that the text was originally drafted as it stands. 'Athom' doubtless derives from 'æt Ham', as the editor suggests. The term mansa was not normally used as early as this but is probably just a miscopying of manentem, which may have been abbreviated in the exemplar.

The beneficiary's rights over the property are expressed in terms which are not entirely usual but may well be genuine:-

'et ad eum iure sect' (sic) pertinet'

'hanc enim donacionem quam libenter contuli ei habeat ipse in dn'eo (sic) potestates (sic) proprie'.

Possibly sect' is a miscopying of suo or perpetuo, or, as the editor suggests, seculari; dn'eo should perhaps be interpreted as dominio; the editor suggests dominico; potestates has some appearance of having been corrected in the manuscript to potestatis. These clauses appear to be genuine since they have early parallels quoted above (under S240).

The sanction includes a prohibitive clause as well as a penal clause, the former being a feature of a number of early charters. The charter is dated 702, 15th indiction. These agree, but the former may have been added to the document. The scribe has not preserved any subscriptions, so there is no means of checking the date. It could well be correct, but the other 15th indiction in Ine's reign, 717, cannot be ruled out. Following the dating clause are boundaries which have presumably been added to the charter, but it may be that the addition

was made as early as the eighth or ninth century, since the clause is very brief and partly in Latin.

The place-name Ham is not uncommon, and the bounds are of little help in identifying the estate: there are only four landmarks, translated by the editor as the red lea, the land boundary, a ditch and (possibly) a fen. The likeliest candidate is probably Ham about a mile south-east of Muchelney, as has been suggested (Stevenson in Bates, Muchelney Cart., p. 96 n. 3; ECW, no. 367). The description of the property continues 'cum parte fluminis pedrit ad pescandum', and this tends to endorse the identification as Ham is only about a mile from the river Parrett. Other instances of early charters granting fisheries are mentioned in Glastonbury records: the seventh-century king Baldred granted a fishery on the river Parrett to abbot Hæmgils (S1665), and Ine made two grants each consisting, like his grant to Muchelney, of a small area of land plus a fishery (DA, p. 94; ECW, nos. 373, 377). The charters do not survive and were perhaps discarded as unimportant, as it seems that Muchelney charters nearly were. Seventh-century grants to Malmesbury also included fisheries (S234; Ehwald, p. 503). It therefore appears that there is no foundation for Stevenson's suggestion that the grant of the river is an argument against authenticity (Bates, Muchelney Cart., p. 96 n. 2). It is in fact a point in favour of the charter.

The content and wording of this charter seem equally to indicate that it is authentic. The surviving text is ill-copied and corrupt in places, and it is tempting to suggest that the scribe was working from an early exemplar, perhaps in poor condition, which he had difficulty in deciphering, rather than that the errors reflect mere carelessness, especially as the other document written out by this scribe shows no sign of carelessness in copying (S1176). However, the latter explanation cannot be ruled out. There appears to be no deliberate interpolation

except for the addition of an incarnational year and brief boundary clause, and the only omission seems to be the witness list.

Beaga was presumably a monk of Muchelney, and the grant indicates that individual members of a religious community in early Wessex could and did own private property.

* * * * *

S1176

B.L., Additional 56488, fo. 62v.

(Edition: Bates, Muchelney Cart., no. 105)

The other charter added to the cartulary by the second scribe is another grant of a fishery on the Parrett made by the layman Bealthun to abbot Froda of Muchelney in 708. This document appears to be entirely authentic.

Bealthun and abbot Froda both appear in the witness list of Ine's general grant of privileges of 704, extant in the Malmesbury archive (S245). The fact that the donor is very obscure but attested elsewhere as active at this time is a strong argument in favour of the charter's authenticity. Abbot Froda is named in two other charters of Muchelney (S240, 249); his monastery is not mentioned in this text. There is no witness list, but a sentence placed before the sanction reads 'Aldelmus episcopus et Yny rex Saxonorum gentis prop[r]iis + manibus signum crucis + subscripserunt'. Both Aldhelm and Ine fit the date of the charter, and it may be that this wording is genuine as it stands. There are other examples of early charters in which the witnesses are grouped together instead of being set out with individual subscriptions (S252, 1410, 1803, 1806). But it is also quite possible that the wording represents a copyist's abbreviation of a conventional witness list;

this would account for the unusual royal title.

The rest of the wording is entirely normal, and consists largely of formulas common in early charters. There is considerable resemblance to the charter recording Ine's grant to the monk Beaga, as is to be expected in two documents presumably drawn up in the same scriptorium only 6 years apart. The date is given as both an incarnational year and an indiction. The former may be a later addition to the text but is likely to be correct since it is so near the date of Bealhtun's other recorded appearance. The property granted is described as 'aliquam partem fluminis Pedrete ad capturam pissium qui uocatur Swynwere'. Its precise location is unknown.

As in the case of Ine's grant to Beaga, both content and wording appear to indicate that this charter is genuine, the only possible alterations to the eighth-century text being the alteration and abbreviation of the witness list and the addition of an incarnational year.

* * * * *

S249

B.L., Additional 56488, fo. 1rv

(Edition: Bates, Muchelney Cart., no. 1)

The charter which is placed first in the Muchelney cartulary purports to record a grant by Ine of 20 hides at Ilminster to abbot Froda of Muchelney in 725. The wording duplicates that of a Glastonbury charter (S251) except that the estate and beneficiary are different and that the witness list of the Glastonbury charter is abbreviated to two names, in accordance with the usual Glastonbury practice of eliminating most subscriptions, while the Muchelney charter has a longer list. Other discrepancies are very minor and probably represent only the vagaries

of different copyists.

It is argued above that the Glastonbury charter may be substantially authentic, but it includes a detailed, Old English boundary clause which could not have been drawn up as early as 725. The Muchelney document also includes an Old English boundary clause, and it is noticeable that the duplication of wording extends to the phrase introducing the bounds and the first word of the Old English passage, 'Et hec sunt territoria . Erest ...'. The wording is common and it is not impossible that the duplication here is accidental, the boundary clauses being added independently to two authentic charters drawn up on the same occasion. But it seems more likely that this detail indicates that one of these charters has been copied from the other after a boundary clause had been interpolated into the first, and that one of them is therefore a fabrication.

There are reasons for suggesting that the Muchelney charter is likely to be the spurious one. Firstly it is provided with a witness list which appears to be fabricated. It consists of bishop Forthere, and 5 men described as prefecti, 'Weldhere', 'Bruta', 'Adelard frater regine', 'Adelherd' and 'Vmning'. These witnesses recur in some manuscripts of a fabricated Glastonbury charter in the name of Ine, and they are discussed in connection with that charter above (S250). It is unlikely that the list has any authentic basis. If this witness list were derived from the Glastonbury charter which shares the wording of this one, this would suggest that both documents should be regarded with extreme suspicion. But it may be that the Muchelney charter was fabricated by copying the Glastonbury text after the witness list of the latter had been abbreviated to the two names of Ine and Forthere, and that witnesses were therefore borrowed from the fabricated grant of privileges. Moreover the witness list is introduced by a wording peculiar to the Muchelney charter which uses the verb caraxare, common in tenth-century charters but not early ones.

The beneficiaries of the Muchelney charter are abbot Froda and his familia. It is not particularly likely that Froda, recorded as abbot of Muchelney from 693 to 708, was still active in this capacity in 725, although this is far from impossible. His name has perhaps been borrowed from authentic charters preserved at Muchelney. The estate said to be granted consisted of 20 hides at 'Yleminster', now Ilminster situated several miles south-west of Muchelney near the river Isle. The name and hidage agree with those of Muchelney's Domesday manor (DB Somerset, p. 9.3); place-names and hidages in authentic seventh- and eighth-century charters seldom correspond with those in Domesday Book.

But a much more significant circumstance is that Ilminster was the subject of a dispute between Muchelney and certain laymen in the tenth century. There is an account of this in the original charter of Æthelred II preserved with the cartulary (S884, written by a scribe of Christ Church, Canterbury: Campbell, 1982, p. 200). Muchelney had granted a lease of Ilminster for a term of three lives. At some time during this period the leaseholders attempted to claim the estate as their own hereditary property, and produced a charter in support of their claim. The case was apparently heard formally at a synod or other meeting, and an assembly of bishops and noblemen dismissed the leaseholders' claim, confirming that the Muchelney community were the rightful owners. Æthelred in 995 confirms that the estate is restored to the monastery. The probability seems to be that the Ilminster charter in Ine's name is a fabrication produced to support Muchelney's claim to the estate at the time of the dispute. It appears that the community sought the help of its wealthy and prestigious neighbour-monastery, whose personnel were no doubt more experienced in handling disputes concerning land since their endowment was so much more extensive than Muchelney's. The charter was apparently produced by borrowing a wording from one

Glastonbury charter and a selection of witnesses from another, and adding an abbot taken from early Muchelney charters and a description of the estate in accordance with tenth-century circumstances, and including a detailed Old English boundary clause in accordance with tenth-century practice. It is highly unlikely that the document has any authentic foundation.

* * * * *

S261

B.L., Additional 56488, fo. 6rv.

(Edition: Bates, Muchelney Cart., no. 6)

The latest Muchelney charter to survive from the period down to 839 is a grant of Cyniwulf, king of the West Saxons, dated 762. It appears to be entirely authentic.

The charter is very brief and includes no proem or sanction; it is possible that there has been some abbreviation by a copyist, but this is far from certain. Early charters conspicuous for their brevity occur in several archives, and it seems likely that in fact many were originally drafted in very succinct terms. The wording is wholly unobjectionable. The king's title, 'rex Occidentalium Saxonum', is normal for a charter of this date. The grant, like some others of the eighth century, is made to the community or establishment as well as to the abbot: 'ad monasterium quod dicitur Michelnie . Edwaldo abbati' (cf. S253, 256, 1410). Abbot Eadwald is not otherwise recorded. The estate is defined by reference to natural geographical features, as is common in early Anglo-Saxon charters, in this case two rivers and a hill. The date is expressed as an incarnational year, 762, and as the 15th indiction; these are consistent and both are probably genuine. The charter is dated from 'Pentric', which is probably to be identified

with 'Pencrik' from which a Glastonbury charter is dated (S253; Stevenson in Bates, Muchelney Cart., p. 47 n. 1).

In his transcription of this charter, unlike those of the earlier documents, the scribe has preserved what is probably a full witness list, and the list has every appearance of authenticity. The king's attestation is followed by those of the two West Saxon bishops, Herewald of Sherborne and Cyniheard of Winchester, and there are seven laymen who probably represent the full complement of West Saxon ealdormen: Scilling, Hemele, Cerdic, Heahfrith (his name is accidentally miscopied as 'Heaheahfrithes'), Æthilric, Eoppa, Wigfrith. All of these men appear in other charters of the reign and fit the pattern which emerges if the witness lists of all the charters of Cyniwulf's reign are considered jointly. The attestation form in every case is 'Signum manus X', which could well be authentic at this date and suits the simplicity of the rest of the charter.

The description of the estate reads 'octo casatos inter duo flumina . Earn . et Yle . et ab occidente habet montem qui dicitur Duun Meten'. The river Earn is now known as the Fivehead, which joins the Isle some 4 miles south-west of Muchelney. Finberg plausibly suggested that 'Duun Meten' was to be identified with Dommett Moor, whose location suits the information of the charter (ECW, no. 398). The estate therefore lay somewhere within the rough triangle of land bounded by the two rivers and the moor. The only estate in this area otherwise recorded as the property of Muchelney is Isle Abbots near the confluence of the rivers, where lands totalling 6½ hides were acquired after the Conquest (DB Somerset, p. 9.4, 5). The reference in this charter to Dommett Moor tends to suggest that an area further south may be meant, but the estate cannot be precisely located or named.

There seems to be every reason to believe that Cyniwulf's charter is entirely authentic.

(c) Conclusions

Of five surviving charters dated to the early period, only one (S249) appears to be spurious. Another (S240) survives only in an unusual form has certainly been re-written to some extent, but is probably basically genuine. The other three appear to be authentic (S244, 1176, 261). The one spurious charter appears to have been produced with the help of Glastonbury in order to defeat an attempt to deprive Muchelney of one of its estates. There appears to have been no general policy at Muchelney of supporting the community's claims to its lands by means of fabricated title deeds, nor of using charters to illustrate the history of the house or claim for it any particular antiquity. Of the four later charters one is certainly authentic (S884) and two others probably authentic (S455, 740). Only the grant of privileges in the name of Eadgar (S729) really seems suspicious, since it shares much of the wording of the orthodoxorum charters. The archive may therefore be regarded as substantially honest and reliable.

The date of the foundation of Muchelney is not recorded, but the monastery existed probably by 693 (S240) and certainly by 704 (S245, 1176). The early charters afford only two glimpses of the house, one during the period 693 (?) to 708 when Froda was abbot and Ine was a benefactor, and the other in 762 when Cyniwulf granted land to abbot Eadwald. The history of Muchelney during the rest of the early period is unknown, but there emerges from the whole archive and the Domesday endowment a picture of a small and unsophisticated establishment, never very wealthy, and probably always overshadowed by its prestigious neighbour.

6. BATH

	<u>Page</u>
a) Introduction	333
b) The Charters	333
<u>S</u>	
1168 Wigheard to Beorngyth, abbess	334
1167 Æthilmod to Beorngyth, abbess, and Folcburh . .	339
1168 and 1167 - Relationahip and Authenticity	341
51 Osric, king, to Berta, abbess	346
265 Cyniwulf, king, to the monks of Bath	353
c) Conclusions	359

(a) Introduction

The pre-Conquest charters of Bath survive in a cartulary of the second half of the twelfth century, now Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, 111 (Davis 1958, no. 23). The volume is written in a clear book-hand with large, coloured initials. Two charters, one of the seventh century and one of the tenth (S1168, 610), are also transcribed in a sixteenth-century manuscript, British Library, Lansdowne 863; the others are extant only in the cartulary.

Birch did not see this manuscript, and the texts of the Bath charters in the Cartularium Saxonicum are simply reprints of Kemble's edition, which included many inaccuracies. The only satisfactory edition of most of these charters is that prepared by W. Hunt for the Somerset Record Society in 1893, which is based on a transcript of the manuscript. The earliest charters of Bath were discussed by Patrick Sims-Williams in 1975, and the present discussion is indebted to his work, although not all of his judgements of the charters can be accepted.

Three of the charters in the Bath cartulary are dated to the late seventh century and are grants to abbesses whose monasteries cannot be identified with any confidence. One is a grant to Bath dating from the mid-eighth century. The remainder relate to the period 931 to 1066. The extensive gap in the Bath evidence from the mid-eighth century to the mid-tenth century is partly filled by evidence surviving elsewhere and relating to the ownership of the monastery during the earlier part of this period.

(b) The Charters

The four extant early charters in the Bath archive are listed below:-

<u>S</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Donor</u>	<u>Beneficiary</u>
1168	671/2	Wigheard	Beorngyth, abbess
51	675	Osric, king	Berta, abbess
1167	680	Æthilmod	Beorngyth, abbess, and Folcburh
265	758	Cyniwulf, king	The monks of Bath

The charters of Wigheard and Æthilmod are discussed first, as they are connected. Each of the two is described separately, then the questions of their relationship and authenticity are considered.

S1168

Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 111, p. 59.

(Edition: Hunt, Bath Charters, no. 6)

This charter records a grant of land by Wigheard, who is given no title and was presumably a layman, to an abbess named Beorngyth and to her monastery, which is not named. The grant was made with the consent of Wulfhere, king of the Mercians, and is dated to the 14th year of his reign. Appended to the charter are a second dating clause inconsistent with the first, and a witness list which includes Wulfhere's brother and successor, Æthilred.

In order to date the charter it is necessary to date the reign of Wulfhere. The Chronicle provides a simple and schematic account of the Mercian kings of the second half of the seventh century:-

655: Penda died and Peada succeeded;

657: Peada died and Wulfhere succeeded;

675: Wulfhere died and Æthilred succeeded.

This appears to be based on a Mercian kinglist reading Penda . Peada . Wulfhere . Æthilred, used in conjunction with the information of Bede's chronological summary that Penda died in 655 and Wulfhere in 675 after a reign of 17 years (HE V 24). The reality was not so straightforward.

On the death of Penda at the battle of the Winwæd, Oswiu of Northumbria took control of Mercia and ruled it for 3 years. He gave Penda's son, Peada, who was his own son-in-law, the kingship of that part of Mercia which lay south of the Trent, but Peada was murdered at Easter 656, whereupon Oswiu apparently ruled the whole kingdom through his ealdormen until three years after Penda's death, when a number of Mercian ealdormen led a successful rebellion, put an end to Northumbrian power in Mercia, and established the young Wulfhere as king (HE III 24). Bede's information therefore is that Wulfhere reigned from 658 to 675. On this basis his 14th regnal year would be 671/2.

It is not impossible that those calculating Wulfhere's regnal years took the view that he had been the rightful king of Mercia from the time of Peada's, or even of Penda's death, and calculated accordingly. There is, of course, evidence for this sort of practice in Anglo-Saxon England (HE III 1). But there is no direct evidence that this was done in the case of Wulfhere's reign. Extant Mercian kinglists recognise Peada and assign to Penda's three sons reigns totalling 47 years, two years short of the actual period of time from Penda's death in 655 to the abdication of Æthilred in 704 (Dumville 1975, pp. 33, 36), suggesting that two years of Northumbrian rule were not added to any reign but were simply disregarded. The correct date of the charter is therefore likely to be 671 or 672, although a date 2-3 years earlier cannot be ruled out. On either interpretation the document, if genuine, is one of the earliest surviving Anglo-Saxon charters, and probably the earliest of all.

The only other charter to survive from the reign of Wulfhere is the grant of Frithuwald to abbot Eorcenwald of Chertsey, which dates from a year or two later (S1165). This is attested by a man named Wigheard who is described as a subregulus, and is probably to be identified with

the donor of the Bath charter. Abbess Beorngyth is known only from her appearances in this charter and the one connected with it. The spelling of her name, 'Berguidi' with ui for y, has been noticed as an early feature (Sims-Williams 1975, p. 3).

The wording of the charter includes clauses paralleled in some of the earliest surviving Anglo-Saxon documents and also in early continental texts. The date is placed at the beginning of the document, is given as a regnal year, and is introduced by an ablative absolute construction. Such clauses occur in Italian deeds from at least the time of Gregory the Great; they are rare in England, but an example appears in the report of the Council of Hatfield in 680:-

S1168: 'Regnante Wlfero rege . anno . xiiii . regni sui';

Gregory's grant to St. Andrew's of 587 (Hartmann, Gregory, pp. 437-9):

'Imperante domno Mauritio Tyberio perpetuo Augusto anno sexto';

Council of Hatfield (HE IV 17):-

'Imperantibus dominis piissimis nostris Ecgfrido rege Humbronensium, anno decimo regni eius ...';

Lombard deed of 713 (Schiaparelli, Cod. Dip. Longobardo, no. 16):-

'regnante domino nostro Liutprand viro excelentissimo rege, anno filicissimi regni eius ...'.

The beneficiary is addressed in the second person, which is a feature of some of the earliest Anglo-Saxon charters, but quickly died out except in Kent where it became the standard practice (see S235). The wording states that the grant is made not only to the abbess but also to her monastery; similar wordings occur in Gregory's grant of 587, and in the oldest extant original Anglo-Saxon charter, Hlothere's grant of 679:-

S1168: 'tibi Bernguidi . uenerabili abbatisse . et per te monasterio tuo';

Gregory: 'monasterio santi Andreae ... in quo est Maximianus reverendissimus abbas et per eum in eodem venerabili monasterio';

S8: 'tibi Bercuald . tuoque monasterio'.

The description of the beneficiary's rights over the estate also has early parallels:-

S1168: 'ut habeas . teneas . iure dominio . tam tuo quam monasterii tui uindices ac defendas';

Gregory: 'habeat, teneat, possideat, iure dominioque sui in perpetuum vendicat ac defendat';

Private deed from Ravenna, c. 600 (CH. L.A., Part XXI, no. 717):

'habeant, teneant, possideant, iuri dominioque more, quo voluerit in perpetuo vindicent atque defendant';

S8: 'teneas possideas tu posterique tui inperpetuum defendant'.

Much of the sanction is expressed in normal terms, stating that a transgressor will render account on the day of judgement. The additional clause, 'et condemnatum esse cum ipsis qui ad sinistram ituri sunt', is unusual, but the reference to a malefactor being condemned is not without parallel (S8, 1171). There can be little doubt that the wording of the charter is entirely genuine.

The second dating clause and the witness list do not appear to have been part of this charter originally. The date given here is the month of October in the 9th indiction. During Wulfhere's reign the 9th indiction occurred only in 666, which does not fit the regnal year. The witness list contains four names: archbishop Theodore, bishops Putta and Bosel (the manuscript actually describes Putta erroneously as archbishop) and king Æthilred. The 9th indiction occurred during the episcopate of Theodore and the reign of Æthilred in 680/1; the indictional year began in September, and the charter is dated October, so the correct date is October 680, and not 681 as is sometimes stated (S1167; EHD, no. 57; Sims-Williams 1975, p. 3). The other two witnesses also fit this date. Putta was bishop of Rochester until 676, when Æthilred of Mercia ravaged Kent and destroyed the see, whereupon Putta

took refuge in Mercia and became the first bishop of the Mægonsæte (HE IV 12; Page 1966, p. 6). The date of his death is not recorded, but his successor, Tyrctil, first appears in witness lists which probably date from the 690s (S53, 1248). Bosel was the first holder of the see of Worcester (Page 1966, p. 6), and appears in another witness list which dates from 681 (S71). He retired on consequence of ill-health c. 690 (HE IV 23). The phrase 'gratia dei' which was characteristic of Theodore (HE IV 17; S10, 13, 71), is here used in all four subscriptions: possibly Theodore dictated his own attestation, and the others were then drafted in the same terms. There seems no reason to doubt that this witness list is authentic, that the dating clause belongs with it, and that both derive from an otherwise unrecorded Mercian council.

The land granted by Wigheard consisted of 40 hides 'in loco qui appellatur Slepi'. A tentative identification with Islip in Oxfordshire is usually made in consideration of the fact that the other extant grant to abbess Beorngyth was of land on the Cherwell (Stenton 1935, p. 225; Whitelock cited in S1168), and Dr. Gelling has added further grounds for the identification by pointing out that Islip is at the confluence of the rivers Cherwell and Ray, and that the latter was formerly the Giht, a name which accounts for the first element in Islip (ECTV, no. 258). The early history of this estate is not otherwise recorded. 5 hides at Islip were held by a laywoman in 1066 (DB Oxfordshire, p. 55.1) and four Westminster documents which are dated to the reign of Edward the Confessor, but some if not all of which are post-Conquest forgeries, claim that Westminster owned Islip (S1040, 1043, 1147, 1148).

Stenton assumed that Beorngyth's monastery was near Oxford because the estates granted to it were in that area (Stenton 1935, p. 225). Sims-Williams assumed that it was at Bath because the documents survive in the Bath cartulary (Sims-Williams 1975, p. 3 and n. 3). But in

fact there is no good reason to assume that the monastery was in the immediate vicinity of two estates which it acquired; and a number of early charters survive in the cartularies of monasteries other than the ones they originally related to, for example the Bradfield documentation in the Abingdon cartularies discussed above, and the grant of Coenred to abbot Bectun which is in the Shaftesbury cartulary (S1164), while the fact that Bath was a community of men in the mid-eighth century (S265) tends to operate against, although it does not disprove, the identification with Bath. It must be concluded that nothing is known of the location of Beorngyth's monastery except that it was in Mercia. Since the house was ruled by an abbess it was presumably a double monastery.

* * * * *

S1167

Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 111, pp. 60-1.

(Edition: Hunt, Bath Carts., no. 8)

The other grant to the monastery of Beorngyth was made by Æthilmod with the consent of king Æthilred. Æthilmod is otherwise known only from his appearance as a witness in another seventh-century charter extant in the Bath cartulary, the grant of Osric discussed below (S51). A second beneficiary is named here. The grant is made to abbess Beorngyth and to another lady named Folcburh whose status is not mentioned, but who was perhaps prioress or Beorngyth's appointed successor. Her name indicates that she was Frankish, and her presence at Beorngyth's monastery has been noticed as an instance of the movement, attested elsewhere, of Frankish religious to England in the second half of the seventh century and evidence of the contacts with Frankia which were important for the development of the church in England (Campbell 1971; Sims-Williams 1975).

The wording of this charter substantially duplicates that of Wigheard's, but there are a few differences. The invocation is not the same although it is of the same type; Æthilmod's charter adds the phrase 'pro remedio anime mee' and there is an additional clause at the end referring to the strengthening of the charter by the addition of the witnesses' subscriptions. There is no reason to doubt the authenticity of these clauses, and the last has early parallels:-

S1167: 'Et ut hec donatio mea in sua firmitate persistat :
subter propria manu signum sancte crucis feci . et
Theodorum sanctissimum archiepiscopum ut subscriberet rogavi .
Simul et Æðelredum regem ut subscriberet rogavi .';

Gregory's grant of 587:

'et testes ut subscriberent, rogavi';

Private deed from Ravenna, c. 600:

'subter propria manu pro ignorantia litterarum signum
venerabilem sanctae crucis feci, et testibus a me
rogitis optuli suscribendam';

S8: 'manentem . hanc donatio is chartulam in sua nihilominus
firmitate et pro confirmatione eius manu propria signum
sanctae circis expræssi et testes ut subscriberent rogavi';

S1165: 'et ut haec cartula donacio is meæ et confirmacionis sit
firma stabilis et inconcussa : testes ut subscriberent
rogavi'.
rogavi'.

Because two beneficiaries are named here, the pronouns and verbs are plural: 'per uos : monasterio uestro'; 'ut habeatis'; etc.; except that the singular tibi is retained at the first point where strictly a plural should have been used: 'dono tibi Bernguidi . uenerabili abbatisse . et Folcburgi'. The verbs tenere and defendere, which add little or nothing to the sense, are not included in the sentence relating to the beneficiaries' rights over the land; moreover the word tam is erroneously omitted and the genitive 'monasterii tui' is altered to the dative 'monasterio uestro', making nonsense of the wording since quam is meaningless in the absence of tam:-

S1168: 'ut habeas . teneas . iure dominio . tam tuo quam monasterii
tui uindices ac defendas';

S1167: 'ut habeatis iure dominioque uestro . quam monasterio uestro
uindicetis'.

(Whitelock's translation of S1167, EHD, no. 57, takes no account of the corruption of the text at this point.)

There is no equivalent here of the first dating clause of Wigheard's charter. The second dating clause occurs in the same terms and the witness list is the same except that the donor, Æthilmod, is included; the order of the names is altered; and there are slight variations, none appearing significant, in the wording of the attestations. There is no reason to doubt that the witness list is an original and integral part of this text, and that Æthilmod's charter may be dated October 680.

The land granted is described as 20 hides 'iuxta flumen quod appellatur Ceruelle', i.e. the Cherwell. This cannot be equated with any other estate mentioned in pre-Conquest documents, and its precise location is unknown, but it was probably near the estate at Islip and perhaps adjacent to it, so that the two estates formed a single block of land.

* * * * *

S1168 and S1167 - Relationship and Authenticity

Various views have been taken of these two charters. Stenton cited both documents as seventh-century charters and mentioned in support of the authenticity of Æthilmod's grant that 'the words of gift run in the second person and the formulas are ancient' (Stenton 1918a, p. 51 n. 4; 1935, p. 225). Whitelock similarly accepted both charters, remarking that Æthilmod's charter shares formulas found in early Kentish originals and that there seems to be no motive for fabrication. She

cites Wigheard's charter as the earliest genuine Anglo-Saxon charter extant in a cartulary version, which pre-dates the earliest originals by some years, but states that its witness list has been copied from Æthilmod's charter (EHD, no. 57 and p. 375). Hart regards Wigheard's charter as a fabrication produced by copying Æthilmod's but perhaps based on a genuine transaction recorded in a list of benefactors; Æthilmod's charter he considers authentic (ECEE, no. 2). Sims-Williams also accepts Æthilmod's charter as genuine and regards Wigheard's as a fabrication based on it, citing in support of this view the internal inconsistencies of the latter, and suggesting that it was intended to be a geographically more specific version of the Cherwell grant and was perhaps drawn up at the synod held at Bath in 864 when Burgred, king of the Mercians, granted an estate at Eaton (on the Cherwell not far from Islip) to bishop Alhwine of Worcester. 'If Burgred was in fact disposing of some Bath estates along the Cherwell, this might be the occasion for fabricating the Islip charter in its present form' (Sims-Williams 1975, p. 3 and n. 2; S210). Gelling lists Æthilmod's charter as genuine and Wigheard's as interpolated but accepts the possibility that the latter is a fabrication (ECTV, nos. 258, 259).

No-one has ever argued that both charters are fabricated, and it seems reasonably certain that the wording they share, with its early formulas, is authentic, seventh-century work, so that at least one of the documents must be substantially genuine. The other point which seems reasonably certain is that one of these charters was modelled on the other, since there could not otherwise be such extensive duplication of wording. On the basis of these two assumptions, three possible alternative explanations for the two charters may be suggested: 1. Æthilmod's charter is genuine and Wigheard's a fabrication based on it. 2. Wigheard's charter is genuine and Æthilmod's a fabrication based on it;

3. both charters are genuine and the author of Æthilmod's, writing in 680, used the earlier document for guidance. These hypotheses are considered in turn below.

It is far from certain that the dating clause and witness list of later date which are appended to Wigheard's charter are rightly regarded as evidence of fabrication or interpolation. Dr. Brooks has suggested the possibility that the cartularist's eye jumped to the wrong charter at this point (Cited in ECTV, no. 258). But perhaps a more likely explanation is that the witness list appended to Æthilmod's charter in 680 to record Æthilred's consent was at the same time appended to Wigheard's charter to record Æthilred's confirmation of the earlier transaction. There are plenty of examples of witness lists of later date being added to authentic charters as evidence of confirmation. In particular, one may cite the Malmesbury charter dating from the reign of Centwine (S1176) to which a dating clause and witness list of the reign of Ceadwalla were added, probably on the occasion of a grant of Ceadwalla to Malmesbury (S231). The original witness list of Wigheard's charter (if it had one) might have been discarded when the 680 list was added, or dropped later by a copyist. The inclusion of the dating clause and witness list of 680 is not, therefore, inconsistent with the theory that the charter is genuine.

Moreover, there are serious obstacles to the theory of fabrication. Firstly, the donor is known to have been living at about the time of this grant, and his name would not have been known to a forger. Hart gets round this difficulty by postulating a list of benefactors, but there is no evidence for such a list, and this theory does not resolve some of the other problems. Secondly, the first dating clause has no equivalent in Æthilmod's charter and it is highly unlikely that that document ever contained such a clause since it has an adequate dating

clause of its own, and the practice of drawing up a charter with two dating clauses was never adopted in England (except in the case of the report of the Council of Hertford, HE IV 5, and there the two clauses do not provide different information). It does not therefore appear that this clause derives from the other charter and a forger could scarcely have invented a clause agreeing in content, wording and position with late Roman examples. Thirdly, it seems improbable that a fabricator copying the wording of the other charter would have chosen to omit the name of Folcburh, thereby incurring the need to alter several verbs and pronouns from plural to singular. And there are two details which tend to suggest that in fact the alteration was made the other way round, i.e. that the author of Æthilmod's charter was copying Wigheard's and changing singulars to plurals. The first is the singular tibi, where uobis is strictly required, before the beneficiaries are named; it could well be that at this stage the writer had not yet realised that the different content of the later charter necessitated an adjustment of the wording. The second is the omission of tam. This could be merely a copyist's error; but it is perhaps more likely that the mistake arose when Æthilmod's charter was written, and was made by a man whose exemplar read tam tuo and who was concentrating on the need to change tuo to uestro. The dative monasterio uestro was probably introduced later by a copyist who was trying to make sense of the corrupt passage. The verbs tenere and defendere may also have been omitted by the author of Æthilmod's charter, who probably saw them as mere tautology. Comparison with other early documents shows, however, that in using these words the author of Wigheard's charter was employing ancient formulas and that this document preserves a better text of the shared wording than Æthilmod's charter.

It is therefore extremely difficult to account for Wigheard's charter as a fabrication, and the indications are that the document is genuine and that Æthilmod's charter was modelled on it.

It is equally difficult to substantiate the theory that Æthilmod's charter is forged. It may be theoretically possible, but it is distinctly improbable, that a forger borrowed the name of an obscure layman from one charter and that of an obscure abbess from another, and contrived to produce a perfectly acceptable witness list by using the information of Bede, possibly in conjunction with the Chronicle or a set of episcopal lists. It is simpler and more plausible to accept that these names are all part of the content of a genuine charter. There is no known source from which the name of Folcburh could have been derived by a forger, and it would have been pointless in a fabrication to introduce this name and thus necessitate the adjustment of the wording from singular to plural. The sentence referring to the attestations of the witnesses does not occur in Wigheard's charter and appears entirely authentic, consisting chiefly of early formulas. A writer of later date would probably have described the estate in clearer terms. This charter has generally been considered authentic, and it seems that this view is correct.

If both charters are genuine, as seems to be the case, the implication is that the author of Æthilmod's charter, writing in 680, used Wigheard's charter as a model. This does not seem improbable. Writers of later centuries, the heirs to a long tradition of charter-writing, appear to have found no difficulty in drafting individual charters substantially independently. A writer in Mercia in 680, less than 25 years after the accession of the first Christian king of the Mercians, may well have had no experience of writing charters, and have been glad to make his task easier by copying a wording already used.

It therefore appears that both charters should be accepted as genuine and that Wigheard's is probably the earliest extant English charter.

* * * * *

S51

Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 111, pp. 59-60.

(Edition: Hunt, Bath Charters, no. 7)

This document purports to be Bath's foundation charter and records a grant by a king Osric to an abbess named Berta of 100 hides at Bath for the foundation of a monastery of women. The surviving text is much interpolated but seems to preserve elements of a genuine charter.

The dating clause is placed at the beginning of the charter and there is only one parallel for its wording among Anglo-Saxon charters:-

S51: 'Regnante ac gubernante regimonia regni Osrici regis . anno recapitulationis Dionisii . id est ab Incarnatione domini nostri Ihesu Christi sexcentesimo septuagesimo sexto . Indictione .
iiii^{ta} . Mense Nouembrio . uiii^o . Idus nouembrio .';

S52: 'Regnante imperpetuum ac gubernante domino nostro salvatore sæcula universa. Anno recapitulationis Dionisi . id est ab incarnatione Christi sexcentesimo . octuagessimo indictione sexta revoluta .'.

The second quotation is from a Worcester charter recording a grant of king Oshere to Frithuwald, a monk of bishop Winfrith. Much of the surviving text is certainly spurious, but it may be that this charter, like Osric's, preserves some details from an authentic document.

Strictly speaking, the dates of Osric's charter are inconsistent. The fourth indiction began on the 1st September 675, and therefore included November 675 but not November 676. In order to reconcile the dates it has to be assumed that the writer ignored the different year-beginnings of the indictional and incarnational systems, and it is likely that this is precisely what he did, since the evidence of other documents suggests that this was normal Anglo-Saxon practice. If documents bearing both indictional and incarnational years and specifying a date between September and December, i.e. that portion of the year which is affected by the different year-beginnings, are examined, it is invariably found that the dates can be reconciled only on the assumption that the author ignored the different year-beginnings and began both the indiction and

the incarnational year in the same day. Examples are:-

1. Bede's account of the Synod of Hertford (HE IV 5).

24th September; 1st indiction; 673.

1st indiction - 1st September 672 to 31st August 673.

September of 1st indiction -672.

AD 673 - (in modern terms) 25th December 672 to 24th December 673.

September of AD 673 - 673.

Therefore inconsistent, but reconcileable if the 1st indiction were begun on 25th December or AD 673 were begun on 1st September.

2. Bede's account of the Synod of Hátfield (HE IV 17).

17th September; 8th indiction; 680.

3. Grant of Offa to Bredon (S116).

22nd September; 3rd indiction; 780.

4. Council of Clofesho (B312, etc.)

12th October; 11th indiction; 803.

5. Grant of Coenwulf to archbishop Wulfred (S177).

25th November; 7th indiction; 814.

6. Grant of Ceolwulf to archbishop Wulfred (S186).

17th September; 15th indiction; 822.

The question remains which year-beginning was used. There is clear evidence for this in connection with the council held at Clofesho on the 12th October, 11th indiction, 803. In one of the surviving documents deriving from this council (S1431) the date is also given as 'v feria', i.e. Thursday, and the 12th October was a Thursday in 803, not 802, hence the year-beginning used was that of the incarnational year, 25th December. It is possible, however, that the usual practice was different at an earlier date. If the dating clause of Osric's charter, including the incarnational year, were drafted in the seventh century, it is likely that the indiction, being the longer-established and more familiar form

of dating, was used as the basis of the author's calculations, and that he began the year on the 1st September, so that the date of the charter would be, in modern terms, 6th November, 675.

However, it is far from certain that incarnational dating was used in England in the seventh century. There is no clear evidence that it was. Harrison argued that the incarnational dates in the two clauses quoted above were among the authentic seventh-century elements preserved in these two charters, on the grounds that the explanation of incarnational dating by reference to Dionysius suited an early date when this system was new and unfamiliar (Harrison 1976, pp. 67-8). But there are considerations which operate against this theory. Firstly the dates of Oshere's charter do not agree, 680 being the 8th indiction, not the 6th, and Harrison's suggestion that this is merely a scribal error is unconvincing. Secondly both charters contain a considerable amount of undoubtedly spurious material, and this lessens any belief which might be placed in any unusual feature of their wordings: such features are more likely to be part of the interpolated material than genuine seventh-century work. Thirdly it is far from certain that these charters are independent of one another. Oshere's charter survives in the Worcester cartulary, and in the late eighth century Bath was owned by the see of Worcester and was one of the properties whose ownership was the subject of a dispute between Offa and Worcester, resolved in 781 when Bath passed into Offa's possession (Sl257). It may be that incarnational dates were added to both charters at Worcester in the eighth century. The opening clause of Osric's charter with its unfinished ablative absolute and reference to Osric's reign suggests that the charter was originally dated by a regnal year, perhaps introduced by an ablative as in Wigheard's charter. The indiction, month and day are likely to be genuine and the witness list also provides some evidence for the

242.
date. The conclusion remains the same, that the date of the document is 6th November 675.

Following the dating clause is a lengthy proem which bears no resemblance to genuine seventh-century proems in either content or wording and appears to be entirely spurious. It refers to the ending of the pagan religion and the founding of an episcopal see to spread the new faith, and states that further religious houses are now to be founded in the form of monasteries, some for men and some for women: 'cenobilia etiam loca sparsim uirorum . sparsimque uirginum deo famulantium erigenda statuimus'. The author of this clause seems to assume that monasteries for women are not entirely separate from those for men, an assumption which does not suit seventh-century circumstances when the double monastery was the normal type of establishment for female religious in England. Moreover, early Anglo-Saxon writers tended not to use the term uirgines in referring to nuns, since at this period many Anglo-Saxon nuns were widows and some were wives separated from their husbands (Lapidge and Herren, pp. 54-5). The see mentioned in the proem is not named, but since Osric , the donor, is recorded as a king of the Hwicce (as is detailed below) and Bath is said, in the Historia Brittanum, to be in the land of the Hwicce (Historia Brittanum, p. 81; Campbell 1982, pp. 40-1), presumably the Hwiccian see of Worcester is meant. The purpose of this clause was perhaps to suggest that Bath was a Hwiccian establishment and closely connected with the see of Worcester from the time of its foundation, and moreover that it was founded at such an early date as to have played a part in the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons.

The dispositio is probably based on that of a genuine charter recording a grant of king Osric to abbess Berta. An Osric subregulus who attests Frithuwald's grant to Chertsey (S1165) is probably to be identified with the donor of the Bath charter, and Bede mentions Osric

as a king of the Hwicce active in the 680s (HE IV 23). The beneficiary is named as 'Bertane abbatisse'; the oblique case derives from Berta, not Bertana as is sometimes assumed, and the name is Frankish, so abbess Berta, who is otherwise unrecorded, presumably came over to England in much the same circumstances as Folcburh (Sims-Williams 1975, p. 2). Her name is not likely to have been invented, but probably derives from a genuine seventh-century record.

It appears, however, that the transaction which is the subject of the extant text is spurious and has been substituted for whatever was in the genuine charter used by the compiler. Osric grants 'centum manentes qui adiecent ciuitati que uocatur hat Bathu . tribuens ad construendum monasterium sanctarum uirginum'. The exceptionally large and round number of hides is suspicious. The word 'tribuens' is redundant: a seventh-century writer would simply have put 'ad construendum monasterium'. The 'monasterium sanctarum uirginum' belongs to the same order of ideas as the 'Cenobilia etiam loca sparsim uirorum . sparsimque uirginum' of the proem. Moreover it is not usual to find that an abbot or abbess is already on the scene when an estate is granted for the foundation of a monastery (S89, 235, 252, 255; but cf. S53). The conclusion seems to be that Osric's charter has been adapted to convert it into a foundation charter for Bath. It was probably not a foundation charter originally and Berta's monastery was probably not at Bath. As mentioned above, Bath was a monastery of men in the mid-eighth century, and is therefore unlikely to have been a double monastery in the late seventh century. If Osric's charter is correctly dated to 675, Berta's house cannot be identified with the one ruled by abbess Beorngyth from c. 671 to 680. It can only be suggested that Berta's monastery was somewhere in the province of the Hwicce.

Much of the wording of the dispositio is unusual although nothing

in it can definitely be identified as the usage of a later age. It has probably been substantially rewritten. It is followed by a sanction consisting of prohibitive clause and penal clause. The first is rather unusual in wording and probably spurious although it could be based on a genuine clause. The second is probably authentic as it resembles the sanction of a genuine charter of the 670s, Coenred's grant to Bectun (S1164; Sims-Williams 1975, p. 5).

The witness list appears to be genuine and apparently derives from a synod. The name of the donor is followed by that of Æthilred, king of the Mercians. Then archbishop Theodore attests and four bishops follow. Leuthere's episcopate cannot be dated with any certainty, but he was bishop of the West Saxons in the 670s (HE III 7). Wilfrid of York is not otherwise recorded as visiting Mercia at this date, but is quite likely to have made frequent visits to the monasteries he founded on lands granted by Wulfhere (Colgrave, Wilfrid, ch. XIV, p. 30) in the period before his expulsion from Northumbria by king Ecgfrith led to his alienation from the Mercian royal family. 'Hedda' must be Hæddi of Wessex, Leuthere's successor, as no other bishop recorded as active in the 670s bore this name. His presence implies that he was consecrated in Leuthere's lifetime and that both were active at the same time. This is unusual but not entirely without parallel. Bishop Headda of Mercia and his successor, bishop Worr, are both included in two witness lists of the early eighth century and were apparently active at the same time (S22, 248; the former is spurious, but the witness list which is said to derive from the Council of Clofesho in 716 appears genuine). Eorcenwald of London and Seaxwulf of Mercia were consecrated as bishops by Theodore not long after the Council of Hertford in 672 (HE IV 6). The former was still active in this capacity during the early part of Ine's reign (Attenborough, Laws, p. 36). Seaxwulf

attests Æthilmod's charter of 680 (S1167).

There are four lay witnesses, Baldred, Oswald, 'Gadfrith' and Æthilmod. The first may be the West Saxon rex or patricius who was active in the reign of Centwine and recorded as a benefactor of Glastonbury and Malmesbury (S236, 1170). Oswald is otherwise recorded only in an extremely dubious charter purporting to record grants of Æthilred of Mercia to the brothers Osric and Oswald of lands at Gloucester and Pershore, and Osric's foundation of the monastery at Gloucester (S70). Little faith can be placed in this document, but it may be based ultimately on some authentic record, and it is quite possible that Oswald was Osric's brother. It need not be doubted at least that he was a relative and member of the Hwiccan royal family. 'Gadfrith' is not recorded elsewhere as a personal name, and it seems likely that this is a miscopying of Eadfrith. He is perhaps to be identified with the princeps who appears in another charter with king Æthilred and bishop Seaxwulf (S1806). Æthilmod is otherwise known only as the donor of the grant to abbess Beorngyth discussed above. The attestation forms are all acceptable. Those of Theodore and Leuthere include the characteristic phrases 'gratia dei' and 'acsi indignus' and Osric's, with its relative clause, bears some resemblance to that of the donor in Coenred's charter:-

S51: 'Signum manus Osrici regis qui hanc cartam donationis fieri rogauit';

S1164: 'Ego Coinredus qui hanc cartulam donacionis mee per omnia in manu propria signaui et ad roborandum fidelibus testibus tradidi'.

It appears that the compiler of the surviving text made use of a charter of 675 recording a grant by Osric, king of the Hwicce, to abbess Berta, presumably of land. This charter was probably dated by regnal year, indiction, month and day, in a clause placed at the beginning of the document and perhaps introduced by the sort of ablative absolute

wording found in Italian charters from the sixth century onwards. Its sanction and witness list seem to be preserved in the extant text, and suggest that in some respects the diplomatic of Osric's charter resembled that of Coenred's. The transaction seems to have been agreed at an episcopal synod, probably held in Mercia.

It is tempting to associate the substantially interpolated and rewritten document now surviving with the dispute between the see of Worcester and king Offa over the ownership of Bath in the late eighth century. A charter claiming that Bath was founded by a Hwiccian king shortly after the creation of the see at Worcester, and as part of the same process of spreading Christianity in the seventh-century province of the Hwicce, would probably have been helpful to Worcester's case in 781. But the proem and the wording of the dispositio suggest the ideas of a later age, and it scarcely seems possible that they could have been drafted as early as the eighth century, although it may be that the records of Bath were held at Worcester in the eighth century and that an incarnational date was added to the charter at that time. The charter seems to have reached its final form much later, and was perhaps merely designed as an impressive foundation charter claiming for Bath a greater antiquity than it could rightly lay claim to, and a role in the conversion of England in the seventh century.

* * * * *

S265

Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 111, pp. 77-8.

(Edition: Hunt, Bath Carts., no. 19)

A grant of land by Cyniwulf, king of the West Saxons (757-786), is probably the earliest extant charter actually relating to Bath. The grant is said to be made to 'fratribus in monasterio sancti Petri

quod situm est in ciuitate æt Bathum', and this wording is probably genuine. There is no contemporary parallel for the use of the word fratres in describing the beneficiaries of a charter, but several other West Saxon charters of the mid-eighth century are worded as grants to communities, and not just to heads of communities. Some refer to the familia of the monastery (S251, 253, 256, 260, 1410), others to the monastery or church itself: 'ad monasterium quod dicitur Michelnie' (S261); 'Scireburnensi ecclesie' (S263). The Bath cartulary contains a number of charters recording grants to laymen (S476, 508, 593, etc.), so there was apparently no general policy of converting all charters into grants to Bath, although the example of Osric's charter shows that this could be done on occasions. The probability seems to be that the wording is genuine, and that Cyniwulf's grant was made to Bath; and the fact that the estate concerned was near Bath, as detailed below, tends to endorse this theory.

The rest of the wording also appears to be authentic, consisting largely of standard formulas. The king's title is 'rex Saxonum', the form usually used by earlier kings and still common in the eighth century. The sanction provides that a malefactor will be cursed; this is unusual in a West Saxon context, but occurs in Kentish and Mercian charters of the time (S29, 30, 33, 55, 105). A blessing is included; this too is unusual, but there is a parallel in another charter of the reign (S263). The charter is dated by an incarnational year alone to the impossible date 808. The witness list establishes that the document dates from 757 x 760, that is between the accession of Cyniwulf and the death of archbishop Cuthberht, and it is probable that the correct date of the charter is 758, Dcc luiii being miscopied as Dccc . uiiii (ECW, no. 388).

The grant was evidently made at a synod since the subscription

of Cyniwulf is followed by those of 11 churchmen, representing an assembly of most of the leading churchmen south of the Humber. The clerical witnesses are:-

Cuthberht, archbishop of Canterbury (740-760)

Torthelm, bishop of Leicester (737-764)

Cyniheard, bishop of Winchester (756-)

Earnfrith, bishop of Elmham

Herewald, bishop of Sherborne

Ecgwulf, bishop of London (745-)

Milred, bishop of Worcester (745-774)

Acca, bishop of Hereford

Ealdwulf, bishop of Lindsey (750-765)

Eardwulf, bishop of Rochester

Botwine, abbot of Medeshamstede.

Most, although not all, of these men can be shown to have been active at the date of the charter. The dates quoted above are taken from the Chronicle and the Historia Regum, and charter evidence helps in some cases. Cyniheard of Winchester appears in later charters of Cyniwulf's reign (S261, 262, 1256). Herewald of Sherborne attests both earlier and later charters (S96, 261, etc.). Ecgwulf of London witnesses a charter of the 760s (S143). Eardwulf of Rochester appears in earlier and later charters (S1429, 34, etc.).

There are six lay witnesses, one of whom is Offa, king of the Mercians, and most of the others also seem to be Mercian. The first, Eata, and the last, Eadbald, both attest with Æthilbald in 757 (S96) and with Offa in later charters (S58, 105, 108, 140, etc.). Ealhfrith is probably to be identified with the West Saxon layman who attests with Cyniwulf in 757 and 758 (S96, 266). Diera is otherwise unrecorded, and Ealdberht is known only from his attestation of a Hwiccan charter of 757 which is dubious but probably based on authentic materials, and

whose witness list also includes Offa, Eata and probably Eadbald (S55). The kings, the archbishop and the bishops all attest in a form of words based on the formula 'Ego X consensi'. The laymen and the abbot attest in the form 'Signum manus X'. The subscriptions therefore substantially correspond with early West Saxon practice, and are consistent with a date in the mid-eighth century when this practice was gradually dying out. One name preserves an early orthography: abbot Botwine appears as 'Bootwine', and to represent a long vowel by doubling it was an early practice (Stenton 1933, p. 191 n. 2).

The witness list appears to be genuine, but it is not clear how it should be interpreted. All the names may derive from one meeting, or Offa's attestation, and also perhaps those of other Mercians, may have been added at a later date. The attestations are arranged in the surviving MS as follows:-

p. 77)

Cyniwulf, king	-----
Cuthberht, archbishop	-----
Torthelm, bishop	----- Hereward, bishop -----
Cyniheard, bishop	----- Ecgwulf, bishop -----
Eanfrith, bishop	----- Milred, bishop -----

p. 78)

Acca, bishop	-----	Botwine, abbot	-----
Aldwulf, bishop	-----	Eata	----- Diera -----
Eardwulf, bishop	-----	Alhfrith	----- Aldherbt -----
Offa, king	-----	Eadbald	-----

It seems likely that the third column on page 78 begins one line lower than the other two solely because the attestation of abbot Botwine, being longer by the inclusion of a title than those of the laymen, left

insufficient space for the third column to begin on that line. On this basis the order in which the names on page 78 should be read appears to be: down column 1 to Eardwulf, down column 2, down column 3, and Offa's name last. It has been inferred that Offa did not attend the synod at which Cyniwulf made this grant, but that he confirmed the transaction at a later date (Wormald 1983, p. 117), and this may well be correct, but problems remain. The apparent mixture of Mercian and WS lay witnesses suggests a joint meeting; the fact that there is only one lay supporter of Cyniwulf named implies that the list has probably been abbreviated; and the arrangement of attestations in the extant cartulary copy may not reproduce that in the cartularist's exemplar. Hence the circumstances and timing of Offa's confirmation of the grant must remain in doubt.

The land granted by Cyniwulf to the monks of Bath is described as 5 hides at 'Norþstoc', now North Stoke, Somerset, situated to the north of the river Avon and not far from Bath. Boundaries of the estate are given: these are brief but are in Old English and placed at the end of the charter, after the witness list, so it seems likely that they are a later addition, although it is not impossible that a clause originally part of the charter and written in Latin has been translated. The estate is not mentioned in any other pre-Conquest charter and was not owned by Bath in 1066 or 1086.

The probability seems to be that this is an authentic charter of Cyniwulf preserved with only minor alterations: the accidental miscopying of the date and possible elimination of an indiction; some abbreviation of the witness list and alteration of the order of names; and the addition of a brief boundary clause. The document establishes that a monastery was in existence at Bath in 758 and that this was a community of men, and was probably under West Saxon control at this time.

In 781 a dispute between the see of Worcester and Offa, king of

the Mercians, concerning ownership of a number of monasteries and estates was settled on the basis that Offa took control of the monastery at Bath and all its lands totalling 90 hides, plus a further 30 hides south of the Avon which the see of Worcester had bought from Cyniwulf of Wessex, while Worcester retained all the other properties in question, totalling 111 hides, and was allowed freedom from the obligation of food-rent on these lands for a period of three years (S1257). The agreement resembles other dispute settlements of the period in being a roughly equal division of the property in question between the parties, but it seems likely that Offa secured the property he really wanted, and that Bath was important to him for strategic reasons (Sims-Williams 1975, p. 9 includes references to earlier discussions; Wormald 1983, p. 116); Bath was on the border between Mercia and Wessex. The estate at North Stoke 'included Little Down Camp, a fort with obvious military possibilities four miles from Bath on the north side of the Avon' (Sims-Williams 1975, p. 9), while Offa's acquisition of the 30-hide estate south of the Avon, which probably lay near Bath, gave him command of both sides of the river. The agreement of 781 therefore considerably strengthened Offa's position on the southern border of his kingdom.

It is improbable that these developments were foreseen by Cyniwulf when he granted North Stoke to Bath in 758 or when he sold the 30-hide estate to Worcester (cf. Whitelock, EHD, no. 77): he can scarcely have wished to see the Mercian king established in a strong position on the border. Probably there had been a change in the effective political power in the area between 758 and 681. After the latter date Bath seems to have remained the property of the Mercian kings for many years:

Ecgfrith in 796 and Burgred in 864 dated charters from Bath (S148, 210). But no charters from this period survive in the Bath cartulary; the next genuine charter after Cyniwulf's of 758 is a grant of Eadmund dated 941 (S476).

(c) Conclusions

The history of the monastery at Bath is of interest in much the same way as that of the Berkshire monastery of Cookham (Sl258), in that changes occurred in the ownership of the house over a period of time, from which may be deduced fluctuations in the political power in the area. It appears certain that Cyniwulf of Wessex was effectively in control of the area in 758 and also at the time when he granted North Stoke to Worcester, but West Saxon power may have been short-lived. According to the account of the dispute between Worcester and Offa of Mercia, Offa claimed Bath and other monasteries on the grounds that they were the inheritance of his predecessor, king Æthilbald. Offa's claims seem to have been of very doubtful validity, but it should probably be accepted that Bath had formerly been controlled by Æthilbald, as some of the other establishments concerned, for example Ismere (S89), certainly had. The evidence therefore suggests that Æthilbald ruled an area extending at least to the Avon; that Cyniwulf was able to bring the river and some land beyond it into the West Saxon sphere towards the end of Æthilbald's reign or perhaps after his death; but that Mercian power was restored by Offa, probably some time before 781, since Bath was owned by the see of Worcester before Offa secured control of it. For the remainder of the early period Bath remained in Mercian hands.

The earlier history of the monastery is entirely unknown. It may well be that it was originally a West Saxon house and first came within the Mercian kingdom as a result of Æthilbald's military successes, or it may have been founded as a Mercian establishment.

It was probably because of its basically Mercian orientation from the late eighth century onwards that Bath acquired some Mercian estates and the documentation relating to them. These records provide the sole

evidence for the existence of two seventh-century double monasteries, both having Frankish personnel, one, the monastery of abbess Berta, probably situated somewhere in the province of the Hwicce, and the other, the monastery of abbess Beorngyth and her colleague Folcburh, located somewhere in Mercian territory and possibly in the Oxford area. The history of these establishments is unknown, and it seems likely that they did not survive for very long. It is probable that there were many such early monasteries of which no record survives at all, and, as Stenton argued, it may well be that St. Frideswide of Oxford was originally abbess Frithuswith, founder of one such establishment (Stenton 1935).

7. SHAFTESBURY

	<u>Page</u>
(a) <u>Introduction</u>	362
(b) <u>The Charters</u>	362
<u>S</u>	
1164 Coenred to Bectun, abbot	363
1256 Cyniheard, bishop, settlement of dispute	363
277 Ecgberht, king, to Beornwyn et al.	370
(c) <u>Conclusions</u>	372

(a) Introduction

The monastery at Shaftesbury was founded by king Ælfred as a house of nuns, his daughter, Æthelgifu, was appointed abbess, and the king endowed the house both with lands and with other kinds of property (Stevenson, Asser, ch. 98, p. 85). In subsequent years the monastery prospered. It maintained its connections with the royal family, acquired the relics of more than one royal saint, and secured an extensive endowment of land. By 1066 it was the wealthiest nunnery in the country (Keynes and Lapidge 1983, p. 272 n. 237).

The cartulary of Shaftesbury, now British Library, Harley 61, dates from the early fifteenth century, and contains a collection of royal charters plus some other documents relating to the period from the seventh century to the fifteenth (Davis 1958, no. 885). Nearly all the pre-Conquest documents are grants by kings, many of them to lay beneficiaries, and the majority date from the tenth century. However, the cartulary preserves seven documents relating to the period before the house was founded (S1164, 1256, 277, 326, 329, 334, 342), and the first three of these relate to the period down to 839. The early charters are edited from the manuscript by Birch, whose texts are substantially accurate.

(b) The Charters

The three early charters are:-

<u>S</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Donor</u>	<u>Beneficiary</u>
1164	(669 x 675)	Coenred	Bectun, abbot
1256	759	Cyniheard, bishop	Settlement of dispute
277	833	Ecgberht, king	Beornwyn et al.

The first two documents are connected and are discussed jointly below.

S1164 and S1256

B.L., Harley 61, fos. 19v-20r.

(Editions: B107, 186)

In the early 670s Coenred, presumably the father of Ine, granted a number of estates to an abbot named Bectun. The abbot's successor, Catwali, sold one of these estates, consisting of 30 hides near the river Fontmell in Dorset, to abbot Wintra of Tisbury, and drew up a charter recording this transaction which he handed over to Wintra. But he retained Coenred's charter because this was his monastery's title-deed for various other estates. After the deaths of the parties and witnesses to this contract, a dispute arose between the two monasteries concerning ownership of the Fontmell estate, the chief cause of the dispute apparently being that Bectun's house still had, in Coenred's charter, apparent evidence of their ownership of the estate. The dispute was settled in 759 by bishop Cyniheard of Winchester and other leading West Saxons who confirmed Tisbury in possession of the estate. The settlement provided, among other things, that excerpts from Coenred's charter were to be made and handed over to Tisbury with the charter recording the settlement, other documentation being repudiated.

Abbot Catwali's charter does not survive and was probably among the rejected documents. But Coenred's charter and bishop Cyniheard's account of the settlement of the dispute survive in transcripts in the Shaftesbury cartulary. The extant text of Coenred's charter, although it includes a reference to estates in the plural 'earumdem supradictarum', actually mentions only the Fontmell estate, and it may be inferred that the Shaftesbury transcript derives from the abbreviated copy made for Tisbury, in which it would be logical to mention only this estate. It appears that the monastery at Tisbury had ceased to exist by the early tenth century, and its properties reverted to the royal family,

who later granted some of them to Shaftesbury. Æthelstan granted Fontmell Magna in 932 (S419) and may also have given Tisbury to the house; the latter was taken back into royal possession by Eadmund, but later restored to Shaftesbury by Eadwig, according to a charter in which Æthelred II confirms Eadwig's grant (S850). Both estates were held by Shaftesbury in 1066 (DB Dorset, p. 19.4; DB Wiltshire, p. 12.2).

Coenred's charter and the related eighth-century text, unlike most early West Saxon charters, have attracted a fair amount of attention, and most scholars have concluded that they are genuine. Stenton noticed the early spelling 'Coinredus', and the definition of the estate by reference to a neighbouring river which is characteristic of early charters, and pointed out that the phrase 'beate memorie', used of bishop Leuthere who also attests, could have been added by a copyist (Stenton 1918b, p. 259). Levison suggested that 'beate memorie' could have been added in 759 or might have been part of the original text since there is some reason to believe that this phrase was used of living persons. He also drew attention to the ancient conveyancing practice, involving the placing of sods from the lands on a copy of the Gospels; and to the Frankish elements in the wording, the phrase 'et hoc quod repetit : uendicare non ualeat' at the end of the sanction, and the naming of the scribe, and attributed these to the influence of the Frankish bishop Leuthere who, he suggested, might have dictated the charter (Levison 1946, pp. 226-8). To these points Whitelock added that there are correspondences with authentic early charters, for example the proem recurs elsewhere, and there is no apparent motive for forgery; and she was able to identify all the witnesses of Coenred's charter and some of the men involved in the later transactions (EHD, no. 55).

Chaplais, however, considers the authenticity of these documents to be doubtful. He accepts Levison's argument that 'beate memorie'

could be used of living persons, but regards the other unusual features as suspicious. Levinson's theory that Leuthere drafted the charter does not explain why it follows Anglo-Saxon practice in some respects and Frankish practice in others. The extant transcript of Coenred's charter is said to derive from an 'insertion', the ancestor of inspeximus copies, and there is no evidence of this practice in England as early as 759 although it is attested on the continent in the latter part of the eighth century. It is 'disturbing' that parts of the wording of the two Shaftesbury charters recur in two charters of St. Augustine's:-

S1164: 'ex meredie habet terram beate memorie Leotheri episcopi';

S9: 'quæ supradicta terra conjuncta est terræ quam sanctæ memoriæ Lotharius quondam rex ... donasse cognoscitur'.

S1256: 'subtraxit tamen et donacionis prime litteras ... terram de quam diu altercacio erat et presens libellum ego discripsi';

S1182: 'et ut nulla esset in posterum de hac contentio hoc ipsum in libello primæ donationis meæ faciendum descripsi'.

Phrases similar to the 'donare decreuerim' of Coenred's charter occur in other early texts (S243, 1169, 1170), and scribal attestations by Wynberht recur in two charters (S243, 239), of which the second is undoubtedly spurious as it stands. Chaplais concludes that 'In view of all its varied connections the Coenred charter is bound to raise doubts.' (Chaplais 1965, pp. 55-6).

Chaplais' arguments scarcely seem to justify any serious suspicion of these charters. Coenred's grant might have been dictated by Leuthere if he had been in England long enough to become familiar with Anglo-Saxon usages while still recalling, and in some respects preferring, Frankish practice. But perhaps a more likely explanation of the mixture of elements in this document is that it was written by an Anglo-Saxon, possibly Wynberht who might well have been both author and scribe, and then the two Frankish clauses were added, one at the end of the

text and the other at the end of the witness list, on the instructions of Leuthere who was the senior churchman present at the time of the transaction and could well have checked the charter. This is the earliest of the West Saxon charters incorporating scribal attestations, and Leuthere's views could have been responsible for the continuation of this practice for a few years by Wynberht and others. The fact that one of the documents concerned is spurious as it stands does not prejudice the authenticity of the others, and the scribal attestation is almost certainly an authentic element in the charter concerned (S239).

Some of Chaplais' points tend rather to support than to weaken the documents. The fact that charters were being preserved by 'insertion' on the continent in the second half of the eighth century encourages the belief that the English example of 759 is authentic. The recurrence of similar wordings in other early charters is also an argument in favour of authenticity. Admittedly, the similar descriptions of the estates quoted above from S1164 and S9 do represent a rather odd coincidence, but the chief element of this coincidence, that the early West Saxon bishop and the early Kentish king bore the same name, is attested beyond doubt, and it is difficult to imagine any reason for tampering with the text in either case. Both wordings are probably authentic, as are those in the later charters, where the similarity is not striking.

Nothing in the wording of Coenred's charter is identifiable as an anachronism, much of the text consists of common formulas which are exactly what might be expected in a seventh-century charter, and there are parallels in other early charters for several features of the text. The proem recurs in a number of early charters extant in various archives (e.g. S65, 248, 1248, 1787). It is normal in the earliest charters of western England for an abbot or abbess to be cited as the beneficiary without the monastery being named (e.g. S248, 1168,

1176, 1177), and also for the situation of the land to be stated by reference to an adjacent water-course (e.g. S243, 248, 260, 1167).

There are other examples of charters in which a number of estates are granted in a single document (e.g. S45, 243, 248, 1248), and other instances of references to the ancient conveyancing ceremony which involved placing a sod from the land on a copy of the Gospels (S1804, 1805, 1806; also S239 - probably a genuine detail in a charter spurious as it stands). The clause defining the beneficiary's rights in a series of gerunds is not precisely paralleled but some similar wordings occur:-

S1164: 'ita ut ab hac die tenendi . habendi . possidendi in omnibus liberam et firmam habeat potestatem';

S65: 'liberam habeat potestatem agendi quodcumque voluerit';

S45: 'ut possidendo teneas';

S235: 'libertam a me habeatis licenciam donandi commutandi';

S1177: 'ut in tua potestate sit habendi et donandi cuicumque volueris'.

The sanction is of a type which is not very common, but there are some early parallels:-

S1164: 'imprimis iram dei incurrat a liminibus sancte ecclesie et separatus';

S235: 'sit separatus ab omni societate Christiana';

S236: 'sciat se iram et indignationem eterni iudicis incursurum';

S251: 'sit a collegio catholice ecclesie separatus'.

The donor's attestation with its relative clause resembles one in an early Hwiccan charter (S51), and Leuthere's subscription incorporates his usual humility formula (cf. S51, 1245). The entire wording appears to be authentic.

No date is given in the text, and the document can only be dated by means of the witness list. The Chronicle's dating of Leuthere's episcopate is suspect - it appears to be wrong on the date of Hæddi's death (see under S245) - but the figure of seven years for the length

of his episcopate (ASC s.a. 670) could well derive from a very early source and be correct. He was consecrated by Theodore (HE III 7), therefore not earlier than 669. The evidence of Osric's grant to abbess Berta (S51) suggests that Hæddi, who attests Coenred's charter as abbot, was consecrated as bishop by 675. Coenred's charter should therefore probably be dated 669 x 675.

the land is described as situated 'de aquilone riuus nomine Funtamel ex meredie habet terram beate memorie Leotheri'. Whitelock translates 'north of the stream ... it has on the south the land of Bishop Leuthere', implying that both landmarks are to the south of the estate (EHD, no. 55). But the interpretation suggested by Finberg and Chaplais seems preferable: the river lay to the north and the bishop's land to the south (ECW, no. 551; Chaplais 1965, p. 55). It seems reasonable to assume that the writer who defined the location of the estate by two clauses beginning 'de aquililone' and 'ex meredie' respectively intended to give northern and southern boundaries. As suggested above, the 15-hide estate of Fontmell Magna later owned by Shaftesbury probably represented part of the estate granted by Coenred.

Stenton says this charter is evidence for the region of Wessex in which Ine's family was based (Stenton 1918b, p. 259), but the information available to us scarcely supports such an inference. The estate mentioned in the surviving version of Coenred's charter was only one of a number originally granted, and we have no means of knowing where the others lay. They may have been some distance away from the one whose location we know. Also, the occurrence of Coenred's name in the Abingdon records (S93, 241), suggests the possibility that he was in a position to grant land in the north as well as the south of Wessex. Similarly the position of the estate does not enable Bectun's monastery to be located. This estate was the single one of all those granted by Coenred that the

monks disposed of, and it is quite likely that it was the furthest from their monastery, the sale being part of some rationalisation of their endowment. They are unlikely to have been willing to sell an estate which formed part of a block of property in the immediate vicinity of their house.

Coenred is given no title in this charter, but this is not necessarily an indication that he did not have royal status. Another early West Saxon nobleman, Baldred, is styled rex in one charter (S236) and given no title in another (S1170), and similarly the Mercian nobleman Wigheard appears in one source as subregulus (S1165) and in another without a title (S1168). In a South Saxon charter dated 692 (the date is not beyond dispute: it is given only as an incarnational year and cannot be verified) Coenred attests as 'Rex Westsaxonum' and Ine is given no title (S45). In the prologue to Ine's laws, Ine is described as king of the West Saxons and Coenred is given no title. Coenred's later status is discussed elsewhere (see S45), but at the time of the grant to abbot Bectun it seems likely that he was one of those minor rulers who might be given various titles, rex, subregulus, patricius, princeps, or no title at all (Campbell 1979).

Bishop Cyniheard's charter of 759 also seems likely to be genuine. Invention of its detailed narrative is scarcely probable, and there seems to have been no motive for it: Shaftesbury acquired the estate from king Æthelstan and possessed a charter recording his grant (S419), so its title to the land did not depend on Tisbury's former title, which is what Cyniheard's charter establishes. The document's content naturally precluded the use of standard formulas, so that the authenticity of the wording cannot be demonstrated by contemporary parallels. There are, however, other instances of the practice of providing a detailed narrative of the origin and progress of a dispute, as well as recording

the settlement terms (e.g. S1258, 1429), and one detail of the wording of which there is a parallel is the incorporation of Cyniheard's attestation at the beginning of the document instead of in the witness list; Cyniwulf's attestation is similarly placed in another charter of the reign:-

S1256: '¶ Hoc signum ego Cyniheardus indignus episcopus .
impressi ad confirmandum roborandamque hanc cartulam
quam ...';

S264: '+ Hoc signum suprascriptum sacrosantæ crucis cristi
in nomine sanctæ trinitatis . Ego Cynepulf rex Saxonum
propria manu expreSSI ad confirmandam donationem munificentie
meae quam ...'.

The abbreviated witness list, consisting of king Cyniwulf, bishop Herewald of Sherborne and two laymen, Scilling and Cerdic, is quite acceptable.

It should be mentioned that the error of presbiter for prefectus in the last two subscriptions, sometimes attributed to the cartularist, is in fact the editor's: the manuscript gives the titles as pr̄.

* * * * *

S277

B.L., Harley 61, fos. 17v-18r.

(Edition: B410)

The third early document in the Shaftesbury cartulary is a charter in the name of Ecgberht, king of the West Saxons, confirming ownership of an estate. The charter seems to be genuine.

The subject of the charter is an estate of 10 hides at 'pennland', now Woolland in Dorset, the inheritance of three sisters named Beornwyn, Ælfflæd and Walenburh. The text explains that the title deeds for this land were lost, and therefore the present testimonii cartula was drawn up to confirm the heiresses in possession. Originally each of the three owned one-third of the estate. But they later inherited some further lands and a new division was made. Beornwyn went to Dumnonia

and accepted as her share of the total inheritance an estate at 'Derentunehomm' now Dartington in Devon, relinquishing her share of the estate at Woolland to the other two who then divided it between them. Invention of this narrative by a forger scarcely seems probable.

A set of bounds in Old English is provided. This is likely to be a later addition to the text, or possibly a later translation of a clause originally drawn up in Latin. The charter is dated from the royal vill at 'Dornwerecestre', i.e. Dorchester, 833, 12th indiction, the feast of St. Stephen, i.e. 26th December. This clause appears authentic. Other charters of the time are dated from royal residences (e.g. S280, 1438), and one of the dating clauses preserved in the Winchester series of documents in Ecgberht's name refers to the feast of St. Stephen (S272). The dates are inconsistent and cannot be reconciled merely by adjustment of the year-beginnings: AD 833 ran from (in modern terms) 25th December 832 to 24th December 833, so that St. Stephen's day fell on the 26th December 832; the 12th indiction was 1st September 833 to 31st August 834, St. Stephen's day being 26th December 833. The probability seems to be that there is a scribal error here, and the most likely one is in the AD date, D . ccc . xxxiii being a miscopying of D . ccc . xxiv. On this basis the correct date of the charter would be 26th December 833. The witness list has been abbreviated, as is usual in this cartulary, but the two remaining subscriptions, those of king Ecgberht and bishop Ealhstan of Sherborne, fit the date and are quite acceptable as the first two attestations of an authentic list.

Much of the wording of this document is naturally different from that of the usual grant of land or privileges, since the content is so different, but nothing in it appears anachronistic except the Old English boundary clause. In places where the content of the charter

is normal, the usual formulas are employed, for example in the royal title, the reference to the consent and advice of bishops and principes, the dating clause and sanction.

The later history of the estate at Woolland is not clear. The cartularist's rubric appears to claim that the land was owned by Shaftesbury, 'terre ... ecclesie sancti Edwardi de Shaftone', and it would be reasonable to assume that the charter came into the monastery's possession with the estate, but there is no other evidence of Shaftesbury's ownership. The only other pre-Conquest charter in which Woolland is named is a very suspicious pancarta of Milton Abbey, which may in fact be a post-Conquest fabrication, and which claims 5 hides at Woolland (S391), and in Domesday Book the estate, assessed at 5 hides, is listed as the property of Milton Abbey (DB Dorset, p. 12.10). Possibly Shaftesbury had owned the estate earlier but lost it before the Conquest.

It appears that the charter of Ecgberht is an authentic ninth-century document, altered only by the introduction of a boundary clause and the abbreviation of the witness list. It is one of very few genuine charters of this reign and is interesting in that it gives an account of the inheritance of land within a family and of the arrangements made by the heiresses.

(c) Conclusions

Coenred appears in the grant to abbot Bectun as a minor ruler in Wessex around 670. The extent of his power is unknown, but that he was a man of considerable status and influence is suggested firstly by the presence on this occasion of some of the leading churchmen in Wessex, and secondly by the fact that Coenred, although he probably did acknowledge the authority of some other king, makes no reference in this charter to any need for the consent of an overlord to his grant.

It is possible that the power of the family gradually increased from this time until 688, but perhaps more likely that Coenred and Ine were still very minor rulers until they took advantage of the power vacuum left by Ceadwalla's abdication and secured supreme power in Wessex, probably defeating other contenders. The extent of Ceadwalla's military successes and the absence of sub-kings from the records of his reign tend to give the impression that at this time power was concentrated in the hands of one man - as Bede asserted (HE IV 12). But Coenred evidently retained a sufficient power base throughout Ceadwalla's reign to enable his family to establish themselves as supreme rulers in 688. (On Coenred see further under S45).

The two charters relating to Fontmell constitute the sole evidence for Bectun's monastery. The second recorded abbot of the house, Catwali, is unusual in having a British name and may have been British in origin (EHD, no. 55). It seems likely that another abbot of this house is among the unidentified abbots who attest Ine's general grant of privileges of 704 (S245).

Bishop Cyniheard's charter provides an early account of the settlement of a dispute. The procedure in this instance is not out of line with that of some other early dispute settlements in that the case was discussed at a meeting of the king, the bishops and other leading men; title deeds were used by the parties to support their claims; the settlement seems to have been a compromise, on the assumption that the cash payment mentioned was made by Tisbury to Bectun's house, and not simply a decision in favour of one party.

Cyniheard's charter provided that, when this account, and the copy of the original grant which it incorporated, had been drawn up, certain other documents relating to the estate were rejected. There is a similar provision in Ecgberht's confirmation of the ownership

of Woolland by Beornwyn and her sisters. The original documentation was lost, and if it should be found and should contradict anything in the new charter, it is to be repudiated. It was probably normal practice to provide for the cancellation of superseded records by stating in the new account that they were no longer valid.

The Devon estate at Dartington which Beornwyn took as her share of the property is situated no further west than Crediton but a long way south of it. That a West Saxon woman inherited this estate, owned it, and apparently went to live there, may be considered an indication that West Saxon power was fairly firmly established in that area by the latter part of Ecgberht's reign.

8. SHERBORNE

	<u>Page</u>
(a) <u>Introduction</u>	376
(b) <u>The Charters</u>	379
<u>S</u>	
228 Coenwalh, king, to Sherborne	379
263 Cyniwulf, king, to Sherborne	381
(c) <u>Lost Charters</u>	383
(d) <u>Conclusions</u>	394

(a) Introduction

There is good reason to believe that a monastery was established by the West Saxons at Sherborne in the seventh century, but the connection between this establishment and the medieval abbey of Sherborne is somewhat tenuous, since the church at Sherborne was subjected to a number of changes of status between the eighth and twelfth centuries. In 705 the single West Saxon diocese was divided and an episcopal see was established at Sherborne (HE V 18). In the 1070s the see was moved to Salisbury, Sherborne remaining as a dependent priory. In 1122 this priory was amalgamated with Horton abbey, and Sherborne was granted the status of an abbey with Horton as a dependent priory, and was made independent of the see of Salisbury (Williams 1968, pp. 40-2; Knowles et al. 1972, p. 70).

There were also changes in the diocese administered by Sherborne during its period as an episcopal see. The huge diocese created in 705 was divided c. 909 into three parts, and new sees were established at Crediton in Devon and at Wells in Somerset; Sherborne's diocese was reduced to an area roughly equivalent to Dorset. At much the same time the eastern diocese was divided into two, and a new see created at Ramsbury in Wiltshire, Winchester being left with a reduced area (Napier and Stevenson, no. 7; EHD, no. 229; GR, Vol. I, p. 140 n. 3 and Vol. II, pp. lv-lvii). In 1058 the dioceses of Sherborne and Ramsbury were united, with the see at Sherborne (Williams 1968, p. 40).

The amalgamations of 1058 and 1122 naturally increased the endowment of the house, but it is reasonable to assume that the division of the diocese in the early tenth century and the removal of the see to Salisbury, leaving Sherborne as a dependent priory and eventually an independent establishment, involved the loss of many estates and, in all probability, of the relevant documentation. The cumulative effect of all these official changes, in addition to the vicissitudes which beset any religious

establishment over the years, must be borne in mind when documents drawn up, copied or compiled after the Conquest, and relating to the see of Salisbury or the abbey of Sherborne with Horton, are used as sources of information about the early monastery at Sherborne.

The cartulary of Sherborne is a twelfth-century compilation relating to the endowment of Sherborne abbey and its dependent priory at Horton. It forms the first part of a manuscript, now British Library Additional 46487, whose second section consists of liturgical texts (Davis 1958, no. 892). The whole manuscript is handsomely written and ornamented and is bound in heavy wooden boards, the top one bearing traces of having once been richly ornamented. Among the contents are papal documents relating to a dispute between Sherborne abbey and the bishop of Salisbury in 1145, and it has been plausibly suggested that the manuscript was produced shortly after this date, the secular documents particularly those relating to the dispute, being combined with liturgical material in a precious binding in order to preserve and protect them, and thus to provide the abbey with a means of defense against further interference by the bishop (Wormald 1957, pp. 106-9).

In consequence of a modern rebinding (within the medieval boards) the order of folios was badly confused, and paper leaves were inserted between folios. The manuscript has since been rebound, the paper interleaving removed and the correct order restored (Wormald 1957, p. 102; Barnie 1968). The charters are grouped in categories related to their content, grants of privileges being listed separately from grants of lands, and the documents deriving from the Horton archive being placed at the end. None of the pre-Conquest charters survives in any other manuscript, although one Sherborne document which is not in the cartulary survives elsewhere (S1383). Four of the Horton charters are grants to laypersons (S601, 910, 969, 998), but all the Sherborne documents relate directly to the house, and the majority are royal grants. It appears that there

has been rigorous selection of documents at some stage, only royal grants to the house being retained, plus a few documents initiated by the community, or alternatively that charters have been rewritten where necessary to make them conform to this pattern. Possibly both methods were employed.

The estate recorded in the surviving charters as direct royal grants to Sherborne coincide almost exactly with those estates among the bishop of Salisbury's possessions which are described in Domesday Book as being for the provision of the monks of Sherborne (see table below). Halstock may have been an accidental omission from Domesday Book. It was owned by Sherborne in the twelfth century, being mentioned with other estates in papal bulls (e.g. Holtzmann 1930-52, Vol. III, pp. 137-8, no. 13; Dugdale 1817, Vol. I, pp. 338-9, no. 5), and the ninth-century monasteriunculus at Halstock may well have been a cell

<u>Estate</u>	<u>DB Dorset</u> <u>p.</u>	<u>Grant</u> <u>£</u>	<u>Pancarta S895</u>
Sherborne	3.1	-	x
Osborne	3.2	813	x
Thornford	3.3	516	x
Bradford Abbas	3.4	422	x
Over Compton	3.5	-	x
Stalbridge	3.6	-	x
Stalbridge Weston	3.7	423	x
Corscombe	3.8	933, 975	-
Stoke Abbot	3.9	295 (?)	x
Halstock	-	290	x
Lyme	(2.5)	263	x

of Sherborne, so that the grant to its deacon, Eadberht (S290), was in effect a grant to Sherborne. Lyme is listed in Domesday Book as a

possession of the bishop of Salisbury. Simon Keynes has remarked in connection with this and other cartularies which present a similar history of their estates on the inherent improbability that virtually the whole of a house's Domesday endowment was acquired by direct royal grant (Keynes 1980, pp. 9-10), and this consideration provides further grounds for suspecting that charters in this cartulary may have been interpolated.

In particular, it is quite likely that charters recording grants to lay beneficiaries have been converted into grants to Sherborne, and this possibility has to be borne in mind in considering any individual charter.

(b) The Charters

Two documents in the Sherborne cartulary relate to the period down to 839:-

<u>S</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Donor</u>	<u>Beneficiary</u>
228	671	Coenwalh, king	Sherborne
263	774	Cyniwulf, king	Sherborne

There also survives a list of grants to Sherborne, some represented by extant charters, but many not otherwise recorded, and several of these grants relate to the early period. The list is edited and discussed below.

S228

B.L., Additional 46487, fo. 17rv

(Edition: B26)

The document which purports to be the oldest charter in the Sherborne cartulary is a grant of privileges in the name of Coenwalh, king of

the West Saxons, dated 671. None of the printed editions includes the witness list which is as follows:-

+ Ego Coenuualh rex hec omnia confirmans propria manu signum crucis subscripsi. + Ego Wlfhere rex similiter corroborans signum crucis impressi. + Ego Laurentius archiepiscopus hec similiter corroborando signum crucis subscripsi.
+ Signum manus Hugg principis. + Signum manus Romani abbatis.

This charter appears to be a total fabrication. It contains serious chronological errors: the grant is said to be made by Coenwalh to the episcopal see of Sherborne, 'sedi pontificale Scireburnensis ecclesie', with the consent of archbishop Laurence. Coenwalh reigned from c. 641 to c. 672 (ASC s.a. 641, 672), Sherborne did not become an episcopal see until 705 (HE V 18), and archbishop Laurence died c. 619 (HE II 7).

There is no indication that the witness list has any authentic basis. The first three names in it might have been taken from Bede (HE III 7; III 24, etc.; II 4-6), and the name Romanus might also have been borrowed from the same source (HE II 8, 20; III 25), although no abbot of this name is recorded. 'Hugg' does not appear to represent a genuine Anglo-Saxon personal name and its origin is unknown; the name does not recur in Sherborne records. The attestation forms are not those usual in the earliest West Saxon charters, nor is the order of names usual since a layman precedes an abbot. The presence of Wulfhere of Mercia is odd and inexplicable. The whole list appears to be forged.

The transaction recorded in the charter is also anachronistic. Coenwalh is said to grant perpetual and unqualified freedom from all fiscal and secular dues. Provisions of this kind do not appear in genuine West Saxon charters of the seventh century, the earliest grant of privileges by a West Saxon king being that of Ine in 704 (S245), which probably resulted from the similar Kentish grant of 699 (S20). Coenwalh's alleged grant is recorded in the text three times over in different words:-

'omnium fiscalium ac secularium rerum siue operum siue
tributum et cunctorum negotiorum seu in magnis seu in
modicis per omne modum uniuersaliter sit libera'

'De omnibus quoque curis et causis secularibus'

'ab uniuersis grauitudinibus et secularium hominum
turbinibus hec eadem ecclesia cum tota terre et
possessione illius semper immunis et secunda permaneat.'

This sort of over-emphasis suggests the work of a forger endeavouring to strengthen the authority of a document which he knows to be without foundation. The wording of the charter bears no resemblance to genuine seventh-century phraseology. It seems clear that this document is a total fabrication providing no evidence for the early period.

* * * * *

S263

B.L., Additional 46487, fos. 13v-14v

(Edition: B224)

A charter recording a grant of land made by Cyniwulf, king of the West Saxons, to the church of Sherborne at the request of bishop Æthilmod appears to be genuine. It is dated 774 by an incarnational year alone; an indiction may have been omitted by a copyist at some time, although this was not the usual practice of the twelfth-century cartularist. There is no reason to doubt the date, which is consistent with the witness list. Bishops Æthilmod of Sherborne and Ecgbald of Winchester appear in no earlier document, but also attest the only surviving later charter of Cyniwulf in 778 (S264). The six laymen all attest other charters of the reign and are described elsewhere as prefecti, i.e. ealdormen.

The wording is fairly brief and uncomplicated, as is usual in charters of Cyniwulf. The invocation is closely paralleled by one in

a charter of Beorhtric:-

S263: 'Regnante imperpetuum domino nostro Ihesu Cristo . et hoc seculum iusto moderamine dispensanti';

S267: 'Regnante in perpetuum Domino nostro Jesu Christo nec non et hoc sæculum pulchro moderamine dispensanti'.

The proem is not altogether dissimilar from that in another charter of the reign (S262). The charter is unusual in having a blessing but no sanction, but this need not be considered suspicious since another charter of Cyniwulf has a blessing (S265) and two others have no sanction (S260, 261). The king's subscription is of the common type referring to confirmation by the sign of the cross, and the other attestation forms do not strictly distinguish lay from clerical witnesses, which is what one might expect at this date.

Certain details of the wording suggest that this charter may safely be accepted as a grant to Sherborne, and not a grant to a lay beneficiary later interpolated. Cyniwulf is said to make the grant 'unerabilis episcopi mei exortationibus Æthelmodi instructus saluberrimis'. This would scarcely be appropriate to any other beneficiary, and is without parallel in other Sherborne charters, which tends to suggest that it is authentic and not the work of a forger. Moreover, one of the purposes of granting this property, a stretch of river bank where salt could be obtained, was 'ut in diuinis officiorum usibus haberetur' which is consistent with an ecclesiastical beneficiary.

The property is described as 1 hide of land on the west bank of the river 'Lim', now the Lyme in Dorset, not far from the mouth of the river and extending to a place owned by the church of Sherborne; salt is procured there for various purposes, as a condiment for food and for use in the divine offices. This account, although unusual, is not anachronistic: a Kentish charter of 732, extant as an original, specifies that the land concerned is granted for the sake of the salt which can be procured there (S23). No boundary clause is included, possibly because

such clauses had not yet become a standard part of West Saxon charter-writing, only being introduced during this reign; but also probably because the nature and situation of the property granted here was such that no more detailed account of its boundaries could usefully be provided. The estate is probably to be identified with one at 'Lym' owned by the bishop of Salisbury in 1066, which was not assessed for geld but where there was land for one plough and the occupants included fishermen (DB Dorset, p. 2.5). This was not among the estates said to be held by the bishop for the provision of the monks of Sherborne, but seems to have been handed over to Sherborne when the house became independent of the see, since it is included among Sherborne estates mentioned in papal bulls of the twelfth century (Holtzmann 1930-52, Vol. III, pp. 137-8, no. 13; Dugdale 1817, Vol. I, pp. 338-340, nos. 5, 6).

There seems no reason to doubt that Cyniwulf's grant to Sherborne of land on the river Lyme is a substantially authentic document of the eighth century.

* * * * *

(c) Lost Charters

There survives in a manuscript of the late fourteenth century, British Library, Cotton Faustina A ii, a list of royal benefactors of Sherborne and of the lands they granted. The only edition, that of Dugdale (1817, Vol. I, p. 337), has some errors and omissions, so a new edition is provided below. Following this is a version of the list reorganised into chronological order, with the estates identified where possible and a note of the numbers given to these grants in modern handlists.

It is fairly clear that the scribe who wrote the surviving list was not working from charters or copies of charters, but was transcribing

an existing list. This is suggested by the fact that the majority of the charters in the fourteenth-century list are not in the twelfth-century cartulary, and confirmed by the accidental repetition of 'Tauistoke de', which seems to be the error of a man who momentarily lost his place in the text he was copying. The earliest possible date for the compilation of the list in its extant form is 1035, this being the date of the latest transaction mentioned, Knútr's restoration of Corscumbæ. But the entries relating to Æthelred II and Knútr might have been added to a list compiled in the reign of Eadgar, whose grant of Osborne is the second item. Since the list appears to relate exclusively to Sherborne, and only a single Wiltshire estate is mentioned, it probably pre-dates the union with the Wiltshire see of Ramsbury in 1058. The original purpose of the list is unknown, but it might be a record of the contents of an early cartulary, later discarded, as is a not dissimilar list of grants to Glastonbury (Hearne, John of Glastonbury, pp. 370-5; *Cartæ contentæ in libro terrarum Glastoniæ*).

The list was studied comparatively recently by Finberg, who corrected some of Dugdale's readings, identified many of the estates, included the grants in his handlists of early charters, and discussed them in conjunction with the similar Glastonbury evidence in his article on 'Sherborne, Glastonbury and the expansion of Wessex' (Finberg 1951). Finberg characteristically tends to assume rather than argue authenticity, but, as in other cases, examination of the evidence often endorses his apparently instinctive judgements.

A list of charters drawn up not earlier than the second half of the tenth century may well include a proportion of fabricated or interpolated documents, and indeed the charter relating to Eadgar's grant of Osborne is itself a dubious text, including a number of witnesses of much earlier date who were apparently borrowed from another charter (S813; Robinson

British Library, Cotton Faustina A ii, fo. 25.

Explicit de Episcopis Scirboniencibus .

Incipiunt nomina regum eiusdem ecclesie fundatorum .

Kenewalk rex dedit Lanprobi de . c . hydīs . Edgarus rex dedit Woburnham de .
 u . hidīs . Athulfus rex dedit Bradford Cerdel et Algerstoke et Getemynster
 (de) . u . hidas d~~ex~~xui . hidīs et Nutherburie et Ethelbaldingham
 Athertus rex dedit libertatem de . C . xl hidīs . et Cernel de xij .
 hidīs et Tauistoke de . uiij . hidīs et Stapulbrige de . xx . hidīs et
 Cuniton de uiij . hidīs . Kenefulfulf rex dedit Pidel de . u . hidīs
 et Lym de . j . hida . Et (---- Tauistoke de) Cuthredus rex dedit in
 Lydene . xij . hidas . et Coruscumbe de x hidīs et apud Menedip . xxu . hidas .
 Kenefulfulf . rex dedit Snarstok de . uj . hidīs et Talre de . uiij .
 hidīs et Wegencesfunte et Aueltone de xxx . hidīs et Crutesdune d~~ex~~xxuj .
 hidīs . et Wytecumbe et Wlueue . Offa rex dedit Poterne cum pertinencijs
 suis . Egbertus rex dedit iuxta Cernel . x . hidas et Power de . uij .
 hidīs iuxta flumen quod dicitur Woch . et . x . iuxta Pedridune . et
 Albambruth . de iiij . hidīs . Et in Henangre . xij . hidas . et Kelk .
 xij . hidas . Et Ros et Macor de . xuiij . hidīs . Et in Chesterbled . x .
 hidas et in Winurod . xu . hidas . Sigeberhtus rex dedit Boselingtonē
 de . u . hidas Et in Est Canne . uij . hidas . Ine rex dedit iuxta
 Predian . uij . hidas . Et Conbusburie de xx hidīs . Gerontius rex
 dedit Macuir de . u . hidīs iuxta Thamar . Ethelredus rex dedit Atforde
 et Clethangre Ethelredus rex dedit et restituit Corescumbam in oblatum
 et postea Cunitus eum restituit .

Note: Orthography and punctuation are as in the manuscript. All proper names are given capital letters; other capitals are as in the manuscript.

Abbreviations are silently expanded. (.) indicates deletion by sub-punctuation; (---) indicates deletion by drawing a line through the word; an asterisk is placed beneath letters which cannot be read with confidence.

Royal Benefactors of the Church of Sherborne

Donor	Hides	Estate Name in List	Modern Place-Name	County	S	ECW	ECDC
Coenwalh	100	Lanprobi	Sherborne	Dorset		549	
Ine	7 20	iuxta Predian Conbusburie	Priddy? Congresbury	Somerset Somerset		372 "	
Geraint	5	Macuir iuxta Thamar	Maker	Cornwall			72
Cuthred	12 10 25	in Lydene Coruscumbe aput Menedip	valley of the river Lidden Corscumbe the Mendip hills or the valley which divides them	Dorset Dorset Somerset		554 555 386	
Sigeberht	5 7	Boselington Est Canne	? part of Cann?	? Dorset		556 "	
Cyniwulf	5 1 6 8 30 36	Pidel Lym Snarstok Talre Wegencesfunte Aueltone Crutesdune Wytecumbe Wlueue	by the river Piddle by the river Lyme ? by the river Hooke ? Alton Pancras ? Whitcombe Wellow	Dorset Devon/Dorset ? Dorset ? Dorset ? Dorset Somerset	263	558 562 638 559 560 639 561 395	
Offa		Poterne	Potterne	Wiltshire		192	
Egberht	10 7 10 4 12 12 18 10 15	iuxta Cernel Power iuxta flumen quod dicitur Woch iuxta Pedridune Albambruth Henangre Kelk Ros Macor Chesterbled Winurod	by the river Cerne by the river Brit, in the area of Powerstock and North and South Poorton by the river Parrett ? Henegar Kilkhampston Roseland Maker Chesterblade ?	Dorset Dorset Somerset? ? Devon Cornwall Cornwall Somerset ?		563 564 641 402 403 640	7 74 "

Donor	Hides	Estate Name in List	Modern Place-Name	County	S	ECW	ECDC
Æthelwulf	31	Bradford Cerdel	Bradford Abbas? by the river Cerne?	Dorset		568	
	5	Algerstoke Getemynster Nutherburie Ethelbaldingham	Halstock Yetminster Netherbury ?	Dorset Dorset Dorset Dorset ?	290	" " " 569 "	
Æthelberht	140	privileges	-	-	333		
	12	Cernel	by the river Cerne	Dorset		570	
	8	Tauistoke	Tawstock? Tavistock?	Devon			13
	20	Stapulbridge	Stalbridge	Dorset		571	
	8	Cuniton	Nether/Over Compton	Dorset		572	
Eadgar	5	Woburnham	Oborne	Dorset	813	611	
Æthelred		Atforde Clethangre Corescumbam Corescumbam	? Clayhanger Corcumbe Corcumbe	? Devon Dorset Dorset			14
Knútr		Corescumbam	Corcumbe	Dorset	975	623	

(Note: The modern place-names are derived from: (1) Ekwall 1960;
 (2) Ekwall 1928; (3) Fagersten 1933; (4) ECDC; (5) ECW;
 (6) Finberg 1951; (7) PN Devon.)

1921, p. 43; Robertson, Charters, p. 349). And, since the majority of these texts do not survive, any judgement concerning their authenticity can only be tentative. Moreover, the listed charters, like those included in the cartulary, are suspect because they are all direct royal grants to Sherborne, and it may be that some of them were originally grants by other donors to other beneficiaries, and have been re-written in the form which was apparently preferred for the Sherborne archives. Nevertheless it is possible in some cases to cite evidence suggesting that early charters recorded in this list were genuine documents.

The first point to be considered is the division of the diocese c.909. It seems logical to assume that the initial endowment of the new sees at Crediton and Wells was effected by dividing Sherborne's endowment between the three sees, and that this would have been done by allocating to each see the lands which lay in its own diocese. A certain amount of evidence suggests that this is indeed what happened.

Six Somerset estates appear to have been the property of Sherborne before the division and to have come into the possession of Wells. Wellow, according to the Cottonian list, was granted by king Cyniwulf to Sherborne, and is the subject of an extant grant of Cyniwulf to Wells, which may be an amended version of the Sherborne charter (S262). Congresbury was granted by Ælfred to Asser (Stevenson, Asser, ch. 81, pp. 67-8) and was evidently claimed later by Wells since it is included in a spurious pancarta of that house (S1042), although it was owned by Harold in 1066 (DB Somerset, p. 1.21). Wellington, West Buckland and Bishops Lydeard were also granted to Asser, and the charter appears to have been handed over to Wells with the estates since it survives in the Wells archive (S380). These estates are also mentioned in the pancarta, as is Chesterblade, which appears in the Cottonian list as a grant to Ecgeberht to Sherborne. Wellington and Bishops Lydeard were owned by Wells in 1066 (DB Somerset, pp. 6.7, 8). Wellow, West Buckland and Chesterblade are not mentioned

in Domesday Book. The probability seems to be that these six estates were owned by Sherborne and were handed over to Wells when the new Somerset see was created.

Similarly there is evidence suggesting the transfer of Cornish estates from Sherborne to Crediton. Two related tenth-century documents give some account of the history of three estates at Pawton, Cællwic and Lawhitton. The first of these is a Crediton record in the form of an Old English letter from an unnamed archbishop, evidently Dunstan, to king Æthelred II, which has been described as an original with some interpolations, which do not affect the statements regarding the Cornish estates (Sl296; Napier and Stevenson, pp. 102-110; EHD, no. 229, Chaplais 1966b, 16-19). According to this letter, Ecgerht granted the three estates to Sherborne, and they were assigned to Crediton when that see was created because the people of the area had been disobedient to the West Saxons; the lands were later transferred to another new see, that of St. Germans in Cornwall. The other document is a Latin statement concerning the division of the West Saxon dioceses c. 909 and survives in a number of manuscripts, one of them tenth-century, in various West Saxon archives (B614; GR, Vol. I, p. 140 n. 3 and Vol. II, pp. lv-lvii; EHD, p. 893). This makes no reference to the early grant to Sherborne or the later transfer to St. Germans, but states, after its account of the consecration of the new bishops, that the three estates were handed over to the bishop of Crediton so that he might visit the people of Cornwall annually and correct their errors. The motives for giving the estates to Crediton suggested in these records sound rather more like motives for the foundation of the new see. The transfer of estates should probably be interpreted as part of a rationalisation of endowments following the creation of the new dioceses. None of the three estates is mentioned in Sherborne records. Pawton and Lawhitton were held by the bishop of Exeter in 1066 (DB Cornwall, pp. 2.4,9).

Cællwic is not securely identified (Callington was suggested by Napier and Stevenson, p. 107, and accepted by Chaplais 1966b, p. 17; but this identification was rejected by Picken 1956-8, pp. 225-6, and his arguments are accepted by Finberg, ECDC, no. 76 and Whitelock, EHD, p. 893 n.

3. An alternative identification with Kelly in Egloshayle was suggested by Henderson 1925, p. 57). The Cottonian list mentions a grant by Ecgberht to Sherborne of another south-western estate, Henegar in Culmstock, Devon, and this too seems to have been transferred to Credition. The boundary clause of a spurious Exeter charter relating to Culmstock mentions 'heanhangran' (S386), and Henegar was probably included in Exeter's Domesday manor of Culmstock (DB Devon, p. 416).

The Cottonian list itself (as far as its estates can be identified) represents Sherborne as receiving only Dorset estates in the tenth and eleventh centuries, with the single exception of Æthelred's grant of Clayhanger in Devon. The surviving Sherborne charters present the same picture, again with a single exception, the estate at Holcombe Rogus, also in Devon and only about 3 miles from Clayhanger (Sl422, 1474). The Domesday endowment of the bishop of Salisbury consisted of 225 hides in Dorset (DB Dorset, pp. 2.1-6 and 2.1-18), 267 hides in Wiltshire (DB Wiltshire, pp. 21.-5 and 32.2), two estates in Somerset, both acquired after the conquest (DB Somerset, pp. 31.-2), and a few lands in Berkshire and Oxfordshire (DB Berkshire, pp. 3.1-2; DB Oxfordshire, p. 4.1). This presumably represents a Sherborne endowment consisting exclusively of lands in Dorset and a Ramsbury endowment consisting almost entirely of lands in Wiltshire.

There is therefore some reason to believe that after the division of the diocese c. 909, Sherborne's endowment was restricted to lands which lay in Dorset, and the implication is that the house would have had no interest in estates lying outside Dorset and no motive for forgery

of title-deeds to such estates. Consequently it would be difficult to argue that those entries in the Cottonian list which relate to grants of land in Cornwall, Devon, Somerset and Wiltshire made before the tenth century were based on spurious charters, since it does not appear that Sherborne had any reason to fabricate such documents after the division of the diocese, while forgery of a considerable number of charters at an earlier date is not very probable.

On this basis it can be argued that the following grants in the list are probably authentic or at least have some authentic basis: Ine's grants of two estates in Somerset; the gift of Maker in Cornwall by king Geraint of Dumnonia; Cuthred's grant of land on the Mendip Hills; Cyniwulf's gift of Wellow in Somerset; the grant of Potterne in Wiltshire made by Offa; and Ecgberht's grants of Henegar in Devon, Kilkhampston, Roseland and Maker in Cornwall and Chesterblade in Somerset. Of these, the only ones which there is any reason to doubt are Ine's grant of Congresbury, since it appears that Sherborne acquired this estate in Asser's time and a much earlier grant is slightly suspect; and the grant of Potterne, since it seems inherently unlikely that Offa would have owned land in south Wiltshire and granted it to a church in Dorset. An eighth-century grant of the land is not implausible: it was owned by the bishop of Salisbury in 1066 (DB Wiltshire, p. 3.1), and might have been transferred from Sherborne to Ramsbury in 909, being brought back into Sherborne's possession when the sees were united in 1058. But perhaps Offa's name has been substituted at some time for that of another donor; if the true donor were a comparatively obscure man, his name might simply have been misread or might have been altered deliberately to convert the charter into a royal grant.

Another consideration suggesting the authenticity of a number of grants is that several estates are described in vague terms, often by reference to adjacent rivers, and it is impossible to equate the

lands with estates recorded later. This is typical of genuine, early West Saxon charters and is not a characteristic of forgeries. This implies that genuine charters lie behind the records of grants of land by Ine 'iuxta Predian'; by Geraint at 'Macuir iuxta Thamar'; by Cuthred 'in Lydene' and 'aput Menedip'; and by Ecgberht 'iuxta Cernel', at 'Power iuxta flumen quod dicitur Woch' and 'iuxta Pedridune'.

Other arguments can be adduced in support of certain individual grants in the list. The first records Coenwalh's grant of 100 hides at 'Lanprobi'. The place-name combines the Celtic prefix 'llan' (church) with the name of the early saint and martyr, Probus, whose name also occurs in a Cornish place-name which is now simply Probus (Ekwall 1960, p. 374). Finberg plausibly suggests that the church of St. Probus which gave its name to the estate granted by Coenwalh is to be identified with the church of St. Probus mentioned in the papal bulls of 1145 and 1163 as one of the churches at Sherborne: 1145 - 'Propeschirche et Stocland'; 1163 - 'Ecclesiam sanctae Mariae Magdalenae sitam iuxta castrum Sherborne, cum capellis sancti Michaelis et sancti Probi, et omnibus pertinentiis suis'; and therefore that Lanprobi was an earlier name for Sherborne itself (Finberg 1951, p. 98). Use of a British place-name is more likely in a genuine seventh-century text than in a later forgery, so the name itself is an indication that this record is based on a genuine grant by Coenwalh of an estate at Sherborne (not necessarily of 100 hides: this figure is rather too large and round to be believed). This must have been in effect the foundation charter of the Saxon monastery, but, like most foundation charters, it does not survive. The reason in this case may have been that the name Lanprobi was entirely forgotten, and the charter eventually discarded because no-one could identify the estate concerned. There is no evidence in the surviving charter in Coenwalh's name, discussed above, of any authentic basis which might derive from the grant of Lanprobi.

There are two instances in which the name of the donor suggests that the charters used by the compiler of the list were genuine. These are the grants of 'Gerontius', i.e. Geraint, king of the Cornish, and of Sigiberht. Geraint is known as the recipient of a letter from Aldhelm (Ehwald, pp. 480-6), and his name occurs in the Chronicle when Ine made war on him (ASC s.a. 710), but his name would probably not have been used by a forger because grants made by the Cornish kings would have been of no validity after the West Saxon conquest of the area. Many of the estates which Ecgberht seized and distributed were probably held by right of charters issued by the Cornish kings, but these would not have availed their owners. Moreover, Sherborne possessed a charter in Ecgberht's name, also in the list, granting this same estate, Maker on the Tamar estuary, so Geraint's charter was superfluous and can be accounted for only on the basis that it was genuine. A forgery in the name of Sigiberht is not impossible, but it seems unlikely, since a forger would probably not have chosen to make use of the name of a king who ruled only for a year and of whom nothing is recorded but his ill-deeds and disasters (ASC s.a. 757). His grant of 'Boselington' and 'Est Canne', the former unidentified and the latter probably part of Cann in Dorset, is therefore probably authentic.

The only king besides Geraint who is said to have granted estates in Cornwall is Ecgberht, and these gifts are consistent with other evidence which suggests that Cornwall was to some extent conquered during his reign and much of the land seized. The Chronicle records that Ecgberht ravaged Cornwall in 815 and defeated a coalition of Cornish and Vikings in 838. The letter of Dunstan mentioned above refers to Ecgberht's conquest of Cornwall and asserts that he granted to the church a tenth of the lands he thus acquired, distributing them to individual churches as he saw fit. The idea that Ecgberht granted a tenth of the land of

Cornwall may be a rationalisation of what actually occurred, perhaps influenced by knowledge of Æthelwulf's decimation, but it is clear that Ecgberht did make grants of Cornish land to the church, as Dunstan goes on to name the three estates given to Sherborne. None of these is mentioned in the Cottonian list, but the letter and the list agree in recording grants by Ecgberht to Sherborne of Cornish estates, and it seems probable that the records are all of genuine transactions.

Two of the grants attributed to Cyniwulf in the list can be equated with surviving charters. One is the grant of Lime discussed above, and the other is the grant of 'Wlueue', modern Wellow, a village south of Bath, which is probably represented by the charter in which Cyniwulf grants 11 hides of land near the river 'Weluue', to the church of St. Andrew at Wells (S262). It appears likely that the charter and estate were transferred to Wells when the new see was created there, and it may be that the charter was re-written as a grant to Wells, having originally been a grant to Sherborne, or possibly to a layman.

It is really impossible to form any judgement of the authenticity of the other grants in the list. No doubt kings did make grants to Sherborne of estates in Dorset, and some entries of this description are probably based on genuine charters, but it would be unsafe to assume authenticity in every case.

(d) Conclusions

On the basis of the conclusions regarding authenticity of charters and records of charters which are set out above, a tentative sketch of something of the early history of the church at Sherborne may be attempted. The Saxon monastery seems to have been founded on an estate near the Cornish border which was granted by Coenwalh. A British church, and possibly also a monastery, dedicated to St. Probus already stood

on the site, which was presumably chosen partly because it was already consecrated. The state of the British establishment at the time is unknown. It may have consisted of derelict buildings or may have been a flourishing religious community, but in either case it is likely that the Saxon monastery was in effect a new foundation owing little to the earlier establishment, as West Saxon churchmen are not likely to have been content to follow British practice: the evidence of Bede (HE II 2) and Aldhelm (Ehwald, pp. 480-6) suggests that there was little love lost between British and English churchmen. At some point the church of St. Probus was relegated to a secondary role, and a new church dedicated to St. Mary Magdalene was built as the main monastic church. This may have contributed to the decline of the British place-name Lanprobi, which was eventually superseded by the English stream name Sherborne.

The community presumably had some amicable contact with the Cornish kingdom, as it received a grant of land from Geraint, but it may be that this grant was made before the West Saxon advance to the west had brought about direct conflicts with the Cornish. There is insufficient evidence to deduce how Sherborne was affected by the Cornish wars of Ine and Cyniwulf or what role it played. That it was involved in some way is indicated by the wording of the grant of Cyniwulf which survives at Wells which mentions harassment of the Cornish as the motive for the grant. Sherborne is one of many West Saxon monasteries which were established in border positions, and this too may suggest that the communities had some active part to play in the West Saxon advance, perhaps by consolidating newly acquired areas, although it is also possible that these sites were granted for monasteries because land was more readily available in outlying areas.

The monastery became a see in 705. There is no evidence to suggest that it was particularly important before this date, and the reason for the choice of Sherborne as the see may have been purely geographical:

it is fairly central in the western half of Wessex. No reference to Aldhelm's episcopate survives in Sherborne records. The diocese, large to begin with, became much bigger by Ecgberht's conquest of Cornwall, and Sherborne acquired a number of Cornish estates as well as being confirmed in possession of the one acquired earlier from Geraint. The fact that Æthelstan later conquered Cornwall (GR, Vol. I, p. 148) is an indication that the area was not wholly subdued in Ecgberht's reign, and it is impossible to judge how far the bishops of Sherborne involved themselves with the British parts of their extensive diocese. The enormous diocese and widely scattered estates were retained until the reorganisations of the early tenth century.

9. EXETER

	<u>Page</u>
(a) <u>Introduction</u>	398
(b) <u>The Charter</u>	399

(a) Introduction

The archive of the see of Exeter incorporates documentation relating to three earlier establishments, the monastery of Exeter, the see of Crediton, and the see of St. Germans. The history of the first of these is very obscure. There was a monastery at Exeter in the late seventh century when Boniface was sent there as a child oblate (Levison, Boniface, p. 6), but there is no evidence to show whether there was any continuity between this establishment and the monastery which existed at Exeter in the late tenth and eleventh centuries. There was an archival disaster at this house in 1003 when its charters were destroyed by fire in the course of a Danish attack on Exeter (S954; ECDC, p. 10; Chaplais, 1966, p. 4). Attempts were made in the later eleventh century to restore something of this archive by drawing up versions of some of the lost charters (ECDC, p. 10), but, if the monastery had retained documents relating to the seventh-century house known to Boniface, these were irrecoverably lost. There survives no charter evidence relating to a monastery at Exeter in the seventh to ninth centuries.

An episcopal see was founded at Crediton c. 909 when the West Saxon dioceses were divided, and continued there until 1050 when bishop Leofric secured permission for the removal of the see to Exeter. Crediton's diocese had been divided c. 929 and a new see established at St. Germans in Cornwall, which lasted theoretically until 1050, but seems to have been dependent on Crediton during much, if not all, of this period. The dioceses were combined at the time of the move from Crediton to Exeter (Chaplais 1966, p. 9). The archives of Crediton and St. Germans were presumably transferred to Exeter in 1050, and would therefore have been unaffected by the destruction of Exeter records in 1003.

Nearly all the pre-Conquest charters of this archive survive on single sheets, many of them dating from the eleventh century, although

there are a few charters of earlier date extant on contemporary manuscripts. Several of the charters also survive in medieval transcripts. A few of the Exeter charters are in the Crawford Collection, now at the Bodleian, and for these Napier and Stevenson provide better editions than Birch, as well as detailed notes. More recently Chaplais has provided an extremely useful discussion of the Exeter charters (Chaplais 1966).

* * * * *

(b) The Charter

S255

Bodleian, Eng. hist. a 2, no. 1

(Edition: Napier and Stevenson, no. I)

Only a single charter from the archive of Exeter relates to the period down to 839, this being a grant in the name of Æthilheard, king of the West Saxons (726-740) dated 739 in which an estate at Crediton is given to bishop Forthere of Sherborne for the foundation of a monastery. The document presents a number of problems, and is certainly not entirely authentic as it stands. In the most recent discussion, that of Chaplais (1966, p. 10), the charter is regarded with considerable suspicion. There appear to be genuine elements, but it is not easy to determine how far the text of a genuine charter of Æthilheard is reproduced in the surviving version.

It may be best to begin with that part of the charter which seems most likely to be genuine - the witness list. The king's attestation preserves an early spelling of his name with i in the first syllable: 'Aðilhardi' (Napier and Stevenson, p. 38). Cuthred, who attests second, after the king but before the queen, and without any title, is probably Æthilheard's successor. Queen Frithugyth also appears in the other two surviving witness lists of this reign (S253, 254), a detail which

suggests the authenticity of all three, since copyists at three separate establishments are not likely to have thought of interpolating her name. The bishops are Daniel of Winchester, who was consecrated in 705 and retired in the 740s, and Forthere of Sherborne who was consecrated in 709 and does not appear at any date later than that of this charter. If this witness list is correctly dated to 739, it implies that queen Frithugyth and bishop Forthere returned from their journey to Rome in 737 (ASC s.a.). This is quite plausible, since it is clear that not every traveller to Rome at this period was proposing to remain there; many persons went on pilgrimage or to transact business and then returned home (Napier and Stevenson, pp. 39-41).

The next witness, named Herefrith and given the title prefectus, was presumably a West Saxon ealdorman; he is not otherwise recorded. Abbot Dudd also attests a Glastonbury charter of 744 (S1410) and is probably to be identified with the recipient of a letter of Boniface, 'Dilecto filio Duddo abbati' (Tanagl, no. 34). Ealdorman Ecgfrith is otherwise unknown. Ealdorman Puttoc appears in another witness list extant in the Winchester cartulary and apparently dating from the second quarter of the eighth century (S242). The attestation forms are those usual in early West Saxon charters, distinguishing lay from clerical witnesses. Moreover, bishop Daniel's attestation includes the word 'canonice', as is also the case in Æthilheard's Glastonbury charter (S253). It is scarcely possible that this witness list could have been produced by a forger: its correspondences with other witness lists of the time, inclusion of obscure persons attested in other archives, and total absence of anachronisms of either content or wording, indicate that it is entirely genuine, which implies that the author of this document had an authentic charter of Æthilheard before him.

It remains to consider to what extent, if at all, the text which survives reproduces the text of Æthilheard's charter. One section

which is certainly work of a much later date is the long, Old English boundary clause, and this is generally recognised as an addition to the charter. The clause immediately following the bounds is very dubious: this is an immunity from royal and secular obligations with the single exception of military service:-

'Huic autem terre hanc libertatem augebo et firmiter
constituo . ut omnium causarum fiscalium . et rerum
regalium ac secularium operum sit immunis .
sempiternaliterque secure . nisi tantum expeditionalium
rerum'.

This clause has been regarded as genuine (Finberg 1969, p. 62; Brooks 1971, p. 80). Finberg pointed out its resemblance to the next earliest immunity in a West Saxon charter which appears in a grant of Beorhtric dated 794 and similarly has the single exception of military service. But Chaplais regards the immunity with suspicion (Chaplais 1966, p. 10), and in fact it seems unlikely that the clause could be authentic. There is a major gap in time between 739 and 794; no other charter dating from the reigns of Æthilheard, Cuthred or Cyniwulf contains an immunity; and the occurrence of one isolated immunity as early as this seems very unlikely. It is more plausible to suppose that grants of immunity to individual houses were introduced into West Saxon charter-writing in imitation of Mercian practice during the reign of Beorhtric, the ally and son-in-law of Offa of Mercia, this being what the evidence, other than the Exeter charter, suggests (on the Mercian evidence, see Brooks 1971). Moreover, two later Exeter charters, an original of 994 (S880) and a very dubious confirmation of privileges purporting to date from the reign of Knútr (S954), contain immunities agreeing in substance with this one and subject to the same single exception; the phraseology is not the same, although several of the same words are used. In the context of these two charters it may be plausibly suggested that the immunity was introduced into

this text by a writer of much later date. In both S880 and S954 the immunity is immediately followed by a blessing and sanction, and this is also the case in the charter of Æthilheard. This tends to suggest that the whole passage is spurious, and it may be that this is the case. In the later charters the wordings are much longer and more complicated, but a forger might deliberately try to imitate the simplicity of earlier writing. On the other hand, the wordings of the blessing and sanction are not entirely unlike those in Æthilheard's Glastonbury charter (S253), so it may be that these clauses are authentic or have some authentic basis. The dating clause, which follows the sanction and immediately precedes the witness list, seems genuine, and dates the charter 739, the 7th indiction, the 10th April. The incarnational date and indiction agree and both may be authentic, or it is possible that the former has been added by a copyist.

The invocation is a very common one which could equally be the work of an earlier or later writer. The proem has parallels in other early West Saxon charters (S231, 237), and is probably a genuine part of Æthilheard's charter. The dispositio is not easy to judge. The king's name is not spelt here in the early form found in the witness list. His title is simply rex, which is quite usual, as is the phrase 'ad construendum monasterium'. The land is described as 'xx cassatos in loco ubi dicitur Cridie'; estates granted in early West Saxon charters do not commonly have place-names of their own, but it cannot be said that this could not occur. The fact that the numeral xx has been written over an erasure (Chaplais 1966, p. 10) tends to suggest that the scribe was copying an earlier charter, which was later altered to fit changed circumstances. The dispositive words 'impendere curavi' are unobjectionable. The phrase 'cum commoditatibus cunctis in ea consistentibus' is odd and has no close parallels in either genuine

early West Saxon charters or the later charters of the Exeter archive. This is also true of the remaining clause which states that witnesses have subscribed so that no-one may infringe the grant, but there are other instances of prohibitive clauses (S231, 259, 1249, etc.) and parallels for the emphasis on witnesses (S251, 253, 259). Nothing in the dispositio can definitely be condemned as anachronistic, but it does seem distinctly possible that there has been some re-writing of this clause.

According to the extant text, king Æthilheard granted to bishop Forthere an estate of 20 hides in the place called 'Cridie', that is Crediton, for the foundation of a monastery. The interpolated numeral xx replaced one which took up less space on the line, and therefore was probably in the ranges 1-6 or 10-11 (unless it was l or c which is not impossible). The history of the monastery whose foundation is envisaged here is entirely unknown, the next recorded event concerning Crediton being the foundation of an episcopal see there when the Sherborne diocese was divided in the early tenth century. An early grant to the bishop of Sherborne seems entirely plausible in the light of this later development: the choice of Crediton for the new see might have been dictated partly by the fact that the bishop of Sherborne owned an estate there and that there was already a consecrated site, probably a church and other monastic buildings, and perhaps still a religious community.

The bishop of Exeter's Domesday manor of Crediton consisted of 15 hides at Crediton plus a further 3 hides at Newton. There had apparently been a dispute over Newton at the time of the Domesday survey: the account of this estate originally stated only that the bishop claimed the land, but this was later altered to state that he owned it; and it is explained that bishop Osbern produced charters proving that his church had owned the land before the reign of Edward

the Confessor, and also that there had been a suit concerning this estate during king William's reign, and that bishop Osbern had at that time proved his right to it (DB Devon, p. 415). It seems very likely that the surviving eleventh-century single-sheet version of the charter of Æthilheard was among the documents produced by the bishop of Exeter in support of his claim, and it may well be that the document was actually drawn up for this purpose. This charter would certainly have supported the bishop's case since Newton is included in the area defined by the long boundary clause (Finberg 1969, pp. 64-5). However, it could scarcely be argued that the charter was fabricated for use in this dispute: a fabricated title-deed for Newton would not have taken the form of a grant by king Æthilheard to bishop Forthere of Sherborne of an estate at Crediton for the foundation of a monastery. It seems more plausible that an authentic charter in these terms was copied out with some improvements of wording and the addition of a boundary clause which defined the estate and made it clear that Newton was included in it. Ownership of Crediton itself could hardly have been disputed, and there seems to have been no motive for invention of the transaction which is recorded in this charter.

The lack of motive for forgery, plus the fact that the witness list could scarcely have been invented and that some other clauses appear genuine, suggest that Æthilheard's charter is basically authentic, but has been subjected to some interpolation and re-writing in the eleventh century in connection with affairs of that time.

The document establishes that West Saxon power was established as far west as Crediton in the reign of Æthilheard, although how firmly it was established is not clear. The evidence relating to the childhood of Boniface suggests an effective West Saxon presence in the area in the late seventh century, but Æthelstan's action in expelling

the British from Exeter (GR, p. 148) may be an indication that West Saxon power was still not entirely secure in the tenth century. Possibly the new monastery at Crediton was intended to assist in the consolidation of West Saxon power in a precariously-held border area.

The presence of Cuthred in the witness list is interesting. His genealogy and background are entirely unknown, but this charter suggests that he was a supporter, if not a relative, of Æthilheard, and possibly the king's intended successor. The witness list also establishes that Frithugyth and Forthere returned from their journey to Rome.

10. WELLSPage(a) Introduction

407

(b) The Charter

407

(a) Introduction

When the diocese of Sherborne was divided into three in the early tenth century, a new episcopal see was created at Wells to administer a diocese which probably approximated to the county of Somerset (S1296; B614). Whether a monastery already existed at Wells at that time is not certain. The only record of a religious establishment at Wells at an earlier date is the charter of Cyniwulf discussed below (S262), and there is some reason to believe that the church of Wells has been substituted for another beneficiary in this document.

* * * * *

The pre-Conquest documents of Wells survive principally in two general cartularies, Liber Albus I, which dates from the mid-thirteenth century, and Liber Albus II, written c. 1500 (Davis 1958, nos. 1003, 1006). It seems likely that a substantial proportion of the 16 surviving documents are basically authentic. Only 6 of them (S380, 1113, 1115-6, 1042, 1240) relate to estates held by Wells in 1066. Of the 16 documents, 9 are writs and 8 of these (S1111-3, 1115-6, 1163, 1240-1) are judged by Harmer to be authentic. One of the earlier documents (S677) survives as an original; another (S380) is a grant to bishop Asser of Sherborne - not the beneficiary a forger at Wells would have chosen.

* * * * *

(b) The CharterS262

Wells Cathedral Library, Liber Albus II, fos. 404v-405r (photocopy)

(Edition: B200)

The only charter in the Wells archive relating to the period down

to 839 is a grant by king Cyniwulf to Wells of land by the river Wellow in Somerset. It seems likely that much of this document is authentic, but that there has been some interpolation.

The charter is transcribed in abbreviated versions in two seventeenth-century volumes of miscellaneous material; British Library Lansdowne 447 and Society of Antiquaries 128. These manuscripts share several readings which differ from those in the Wells cartulary. In some cases it may be that the seventeenth-century manuscripts preserve better readings, the Wells text being miscopied. For example, 'Cum consensu episcoporum atque satrapum meorum' makes sense although the word is unusual, whereas the Wells reading appears wrong, 'Cum consensu episcoporum atque sacrarum meorum'. It seems likely, however, that the hidage is incorrect in the later manuscripts: they read 'undecim' where the Wells manuscript reads 'ii', and it seems that a Roman numeral has been carelessly read as an Arabic numeral. All the editions of this charter (B200, K115 and Dugdale 1817, vol. II, p. 285, no. 1) and the translation (EHD, no. 70) reflect the readings of the seventeenth-century manuscripts where these differ from the Wells text, including the larger hidage. None of the editions notices the different Wells readings, and none provides a very accurate transcript of any manuscript. It cannot be said that there is a satisfactory edition of this charter.

Cyniwulf's grant of land is said to be made to 'dei apostolo atque ministro sancto Andree ... ad augmentum monasterii quod situm est iuxta fontaneo magno qui uocitant Wielea . ut eo diligentius in ecclesia sancte Andree apostoli deo soli deserviant'. The wording is unusual in that the named beneficiary is the patron saint of the church. There is no parallel for this among early West Saxon charters, in which the beneficiary is commonly an abbot or abbess, sometimes a religious community, and occasionally (e.g. S261, 263) a church, but never a patron saint although this may have been a 'Celtic' practice (Wormald 1984, p. 17). The wording

suggests interpolation and another reason for suspecting this is that the list of grants to Sherborne discussed above includes 'Kenefulfus rex dedit ... Wlueue' (no hidage is stated). It is not likely that Cyniwulf made two grants of Wellow, one to Sherborne and one to Wells, and there is good reason to believe, as discussed above, that estates were transferred from Sherborne to Wells with their documentation in the early tenth century when the see of Wells was established. The probability seems to be that Cyniwulf's charter was originally a grant to Sherborne, was transferred to Wells with the estate, and was there amended at some time to convert it into a grant to Wells. It is not clear when or why this was done. It was evidently not standard practice at Wells to convert charters into grants to the see: another Sherborne charter, a grant to bishop Asser (S380), survives in the Wells archive unaltered, as do various grants to laymen (S527, 579, 709).

Just possibly the charter was altered in connection with efforts to recover an estate which appears to have passed out of Wells' possession. The land consisted of 2 hides (accepting the earliest reading) 'prope fluuium que dicitur Weluue'. The name Wellow survives in a village some 4-5 miles south of Bath, and the estate was presumably in this area, but Grundy was unable to identify any of the landmarks in the boundary clause (Grundy 1935, pp. 197-8), the name Wellow does not occur in Domesday Book, and it is impossible to ascertain whether the estate is to be equated with the land 'æt Welewe' bequeathed by king Ælfred to his eldest daughter (S1507), or the 3½ hides 'æt Welewestoce', now Radstock about 3 miles from Wellow and on the same river, given by king Æthelred II to the church of Bath (S854), and in lay hands in 1066 (DB Somerset, p. 5.47). The estate granted by Cyniwulf cannot be identified with any land owned by Wells in 1066, and it appears that the property passed out of the see's possession some time between c. 909 and 1066.

Apart from the interpolation of a different beneficiary, the charter appears to be authentic. The description of the estate as adjacent to a river is typical of early West Saxon charters, and the boundary clause, which is in Latin with Old English place-names, resembles others in charters of this reign and the next (S264, 267, 268). The proem is not entirely unlike the only other proem preserved in a charter of this reign, Cyniwulf's grant to Sherborne (S263). Much of the wording has an entirely normal, and even old-fashioned appearance: the sanction with its reference to angels, the dating clause which uses the word singrapha, and the witness list in which royal and clerical attestations are distinct from those of the lay witnesses, recall the usages of earlier reigns (S71, 248, etc.). The title used in Cyniwulf's subscription is 'Gewisorum rex', which was also used occasionally by earlier and later West Saxon kings (S256, 306). The witness list appears to represent an assembly of all the leading men in Wessex: the king; bishops Herewald of Sherborne and Cyniheard of Winchester; and seven men with the title prefectus, who are almost certainly the full complement of West Saxon ealdormen. All of these men also attest Cyniwulf's grant to Muchelney in 762 (S261). The present charter is dated inconsistently 766 and the 12th indiction: the latter occurred during Cyniwulf's reign in 759 and 774. Either of these dates is possible, but it is perhaps more likely as Whitelock suggests, that the indiction is miscopied, xii for iii, and that the correct date is 766 (EHD, no. 70).

An unusual feature of the wording is that the grant is said to have been made 'quod uerbo dolendum est pro aliquo uexacione inimicorum nostrorum Cornubiorum gentis'. The wording is ambiguous, but it is hardly likely that a West Saxon king would regret having harassed the Cornish (cf. ECW, no. 394), so the writer's intention was presumably to cite harassment by the Cornish as a reason for the grant. The clause is probably authentic: Cyniwulf no doubt hoped that the prayers of

the monks of (probably) Sherborne or (possibly) Wells for a benefactor of their church would assist in his wars on the south-west border of his kingdom. The charter's information agrees with that of the Chronicle, which mentions that Cyniwulf fought against the Britons (ASC, s.a. 757), and there are two other instances of references in charters to West Saxon campaigns against the British (S93, 273).

It seems that this charter should be accepted as an authentic grant by Cyniwulf to Sherborne in 766, later transferred with the estate to the new see of Wells and there altered to make it appear to be a direct royal grant to Wells, possibly in connection with an attempt to retain or recover the estate.

11. ATHELNEYPage(a) Introduction

413

(b) The Charter

414

(a) Introduction

The monastery of Athelney was founded by king Ælfred on the island amid the Somerset marshes which had earlier been the base for his raids against the Vikings at the time when his fortunes were at their lowest ebb. John the Old Saxon was appointed abbot, and the community consisted of monks brought from abroad, since, according to Asser, the English nobility were not prepared to adopt the monastic life. There were also Frankish child oblates who were to be trained so that they might continue the monastic life there. Asser's account of an attempt on the life of the abbot may indicate that this remote community of exiles was in general not a happy one, and it never seems to have become a large or prosperous house, as Ælfred's other foundation of Shaftesbury did. It was one of the poorest of the West Saxon monasteries at the time of the Domesday survey, neighbouring Glastonbury being the richest. It seems likely that Athelney, like Muchelney, was constantly overshadowed and restricted by its powerful neighbour (on the foundation and history of the house see Stevenson, Asser, ch. 92-7, pp. 79-85; translated in Keynes and Lapidge 1982, pp. 102-5, also pp. 36, 271; Knowles 1966, pp. 33, 102).

The Athelney cartulary was in the possession of Sir William Wyndham of Orchard Wyndham, Somerset, in 1735, but is now lost. Fortunately there survives a transcript made in the eighteenth century by the Rev. G. Harbin; formerly in the Phillips collection, it is now the property of Dr. D. Rogers, c/o the Bodleian Library (Davis 1958, no. 15; Bates, Athelney Cart., p. 115). The transcription is bound in two small quarto volumes. The first 32 pages are missing from the first volume, and the surviving text begins with the witness list of a charter of Ælfred (S1605). Several charters may be lost, but it is also possible that many of the missing pages contained introductory material. The handwriting is clear and legible and the transcript probably reflects the medieval

text with substantial accuracy, although it displays features commonly associated with nineteenth-century editions, such as modernised punctuation and the frequent substitution of æ for e, v for u, and j for i. The charters are grouped according to the estates concerned, so that the seven pre-Conquest charters (plus the Ælfredian witness list) are interspersed among later documents. The latest document included dates from 1455, and is no. 27 of 246 entries listed by Bates, so it appears that the lost cartulary was compiled not earlier than the second half of the fifteenth century.

The volume of Muchelney and Athelney charters edited by the Rev. E.H. Bates includes only translations of the Athelney charters, not editions. Of the seven surviving pre-Conquest charters, Kemble edited only the last two (S921, 979; K1306, 1324); Birch did not see Harbin's transcript of the cartulary, and edited only the single charter which survives on other manuscripts (S343; B545); Finberg provided editions of this charter and of three others not previously edited (S267, 343, 432, 652; ECW, nos. 398, 415, 436, 483); the first of these has been checked against a photocopy of the manuscript, and is entirely accurate. The remaining pre-Conquest charter which is a 'Celtic' rather than an Anglo-Saxon document (S1207; Davis 1982, p. 260 and n. 8), has been edited recently by Padel (1979, p. 43).

* * * * *

(b) The Charter

S267

Dr. D. Rogers, c/o The Bodleian Library, Phillips 4810, pp. 84-8 (photocopy).

(Edition: ECW, no. 398)

The earliest charter surviving in the Athelney archive, and the only one relating to the period down to 839, is a grant of land made

by Beorhtric, king of the West Saxons (786-802), to the layman Wigfrith in 794. The document appears to be substantially genuine.

The beneficiary attests other charters of this and the preceding reign (S96, 261, 269, 270a, etc.) and is probably to be identified with the man mentioned in the Chronicle as one of those who avenged the death of Cyniwulf in 786 (ASC, s.a. 757). No witness list survives, and no person other than the donor and the beneficiary is named in the extant text. The date is given only as an incarnational year and cannot be checked, but incarnational dating was usual at this period, and there is no reason to suppose that the date of the charter is not correct.

The wording of the charter appears unobjectionable and contains a number of resemblances to other charters of the reign. These are quoted above in the discussions of S270a (Glastonbury), S268 and S269 (Abingdon). The immunity is subject to only one exception, military service, and is placed at the end of the document, after the dating clause, reference to attestations, and single surviving subscription, which is that of the donor. Both the position of the clause and its wording, 'Ego quoque Breorhtricus ad augmentum hujus Donationis ...', make it look like an afterthought, and this seems quite consistent with its being authentic, since it is almost certainly the earliest extant immunity clause in a West Saxon charter (apart from Ine's grant of privileges of 704, S245), and it appears that immunities were being introduced in Wessex at this time. Probably the charter was drafted originally without an immunity clause, as was normal in Wessex down to this time, and then someone acquainted with the development of immunity clauses in Mercia suggested that this clause be added (on the immunity see Brooks 1971, pp. 80-2).

The land granted to Wigfrith is described as 10 hides 'in aquilonari plaga fluminis Pedride' and is defined by a detailed boundary clause in Latin and Old English which resembles clauses in other charters of

this and the preceding reign (e.g. S264, 268), and is probably authentic although the place-names appear to have been modernised, as is often the case with early boundary clauses. The cartularist's rubric refers to the estate as 'terra in Hamme', and the charter is grouped with documents relating to Hamme, now Hamp adjoining Bridgwater south of the river Parrett; the bounds, moreover, appear to describe an estate south of the river, but these indications are inconsistent with the reference in the dispositio to land on the north bank (ECW, no. 398, n. 2). Cartularists were not always completely accurate in their identification of estates and consequent grouping of charters (the Winchester cartularist, for example, was not), and this consideration plus the internal inconsistencies of the text make it impossible to be certain whether the land granted by Beorhtric was at Hamp or elsewhere. Hamp was owned by Athelney in 1066, and then assessed at 1 hide (DB Somerset, p. 10.4); the charter of Beorhtric may or may not have been acquired as a title deed for this estate.

Beorhtric's charter appears to be authentic and forms part of the evidence for the introduction of immunities and detailed boundary clauses into West Saxon charters during the second half of the eighth century.

B. OTHER ARCHIVES

1. CHRIST CHURCH, CANTERBURY

	<u>Page</u>
(a) <u>Introduction</u>	418
(b) <u>The Charters</u>	418
<u>S</u>	
230 Ceadwalla, king, to Wilfrid, bishop	418
1610 Ceadwalla, king, to Christ Church	419
108 Offa, king, to Oswald, bishop.	419
1258 Æthilheard, archbishop, to Cynithryth, abbess	427
282 Ecgberht, king, to Æthelric	428
270 Ecgberht, king, to Dunn, abbot	431
323)	
) Æthelwulf, king, to Christ Church	433
1623)	
286 Æthelwulf, king, to Ceolnoth, archbishop	435
1438 Ecgberht and Æthelwulf to Ceolnoth, archbishop	437
(c) <u>Conclusions</u>	438

(a) Introduction

The early history and documentation of the see of Canterbury have been so recently and so well discussed by Nicholas Brooks (1984) that any general account here would be superfluous. Nor would there be any point in duplicating his discussions of those charters which he has examined in detail. In these cases only brief summaries are provided below. Other charters are discussed more fully.

(b) The Charters

The Christ Church charters which have, or purport to have, some relevance to early Wessex are listed below.

<u>S</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Donor</u>	<u>Beneficiary</u>
230	680	Ceadwalla, king	Wilfrid, bishop
1610	687	Ceadwalla, king	Christ Church
108	772	Offa, king	Oswald, bishop
1258	798	Æthilheard, archb.	Cynithryth, abbess
282	(830)	Ecgerht, king	Æthelric
270	(833)	Ecgerht, king	Dunn, abbot
323	(833 x 836)	Æthelwulf, king	Christ Church
1623	(833 x 858)	Æthelwulf, king	Christ Church
286	838	Æthelwulf	Ceolnoth, archb.
1438	838	Ecgerht & Æthelwulf	Ceolnoth, archb.

* * * * *

S230

(Edition: B50)

Brooks has presented thoroughly convincing arguments that this

charter and the related Selsey charter which survives in the Chichester archive (S232) were fabricated in the 950s in connection with a dispute between the see of Selsey and a layman, Canterbury providing assistance to Selsey and being given lands in return (Brooks 1984, pp. 240-3, 317). These charters therefore have nothing to do with early Wessex, and will not be further considered here.

* * * * *

S1610

(Edition: B69)

Another document purporting to be a grant of Ceadwalla of Wessex is also spurious as it stands. The joint donor is queen Cynigyth, and her husband is named in the dispositio as Ceadwalla, in a corroborative clause as Coenwalh, and in another version of the grant as Coenwulf of Mercia (S156). Brooks presents reasons for believing that these names are guesses made by men working from an early charter in poor condition in which the name of the donor could not be read, and that this donor actually was Wihtred, king of Kent (Brooks 1984, pp. 102-3). The genuine early charter on which the spurious documents appear to be based was a wholly Kentish charter, and has no relevance to early Wessex.

* * * * *

S108

Lambeth Palace, 1212, pp. 387-8 (microfilm)

(Edition: B208)

A grant by king Offa of Mercia to bishop Oswald of Selsey of land in Sussex survives only in a thirteenth-century Canterbury cartulary.

It is not clear why this should be the case. The charter relates to the see of Selsey, which was moved to Chichester after the Conquest, and whose records survive in the archive of Chichester. Bexhill, the estate which is the subject of this document, was never owned by Christ Church: it was held by the bishop of Selsey in 1066 (DB Sussex, p. 9.11), and was seized shortly after the Conquest by the Count of Eu, whose family retained it until 1148 when it was restored to the bishop of Chichester who then retained it until the sixteenth century (VCH Sussex, Vol. 9, p. 117). The circumstances in which the charter of Offa came into the possession of Christ Church are unknown. The document seems to be entirely a Selsey record.

Offa's charter has some connection with Wessex since it is attested by king Cyniwulf. The text presents a number of problems and has certainly been interpolated, but may be based on an authentic, eighth-century charter.

This is one of a number of charters in which Offa is styled 'rex Anglorum'. None of these charters inspires much confidence, and it may be that the title is the work of a later writer in every case. The three other Canterbury charters which use the title survive on tenth-century single sheets and are all interpolated (S110, 111, 132; Brooks 1984, pp. 319-21). Of the five Worcester charters, three appear to be spurious (S104, 121, 145), and each of the other two survives in two versions, only one of which includes the title (S109, 146). The single Chichester charter is of doubtful validity (S1178), and an alleged grant of Offa to St. Denis is certainly spurious (S133). Stenton's acceptance of the title was based on a belief that the three tenth-century Canterbury charters were contemporary manuscripts (Stenton 1918a, pp. 60-4). Brooks, while recognising the dubious nature of the evidence, is inclined to admit the possibility that the title is authentic in view of the frequency of its appearance in charters of the 770s and

780s (Brooks 1984, p. 113). Wormald is more suspicious of it (Wormald 1983, pp. 110-11). It is not impossible that the style is an authentic feature of the present text, but it must be considered very doubtful.

There is no doubt that the text of this charter is interpolated, if not entirely spurious, since it includes a series of passages in Old English which could not have originated in an authentic charter of Offa. The first of these gives detailed boundaries for the estate at Bexhill granted by Offa; the second details several further areas of land, said to be the gavel-land appurtenant to Bexhill; and the third and fourth provide bounds for two of these additional areas. There is no instance of an Old English boundary clause which could reasonably be accepted as an original and integral part of a charter of Offa, and the Old English passages included here are clearly work of a later date.

When the Old English passages are discarded, the text which remains is fairly brief and (apart from the royal title) contains no notable anachronism. Several of its clauses are similar to clauses in other charters relating to Sussex (S45, 48-50, 1178, 1183); all of these survive in the archive of Chichester except S50 which is preserved in the same Canterbury cartulary as S108, and all are datable to the second half of the eighth century except S45 which is dated 692. The parallels are detailed below.

Proem

- S108: 'Omne quod secundum presens seculum agitur uix usque ad mortem sufficit . quod uero pro eterna uita agatur . eciam post mortem permanet in eternum. Idcirco intenta mentis prouidentia unicuique cogitandum considerandumque est . quatenus labentibus huius seculi possessionibus mansuras celestium promissionum diuciis obteneat .'
- S1178: 'Omnia quæ secundum præsens sæculum laboramus vix usque ad mortem sufficit . quod uero pro æterna uita agatur utique post mortem conservatur .'
- S1183: 'Nos quidem præsentis uitæ caducam celeritatem considerantes . idcirco unicuique intenta mentis prouidentia cognitandum est . ut aliquid pro redemptione animæ suæ agat quamdiu vixerat in hoc sæculo'.

Dispositive words

S108: 'inperpetuam attribuo possessionem';

S49: 'in perpetuam attribuo possessionem';

'attribuo' occurs also in S43 and in charters of Offa not connected with Sussex, S113, 143.

Foundation of a monastery

S108: 'ad construendum in ea monasterium'

S48, 50: identical to S108.

These parallels of wording in other charters dating from much the same time and possibly drawn up in the same scriptorium suggest that the charter of Offa may well be basically authentic, especially as there are no such parallels in charters of the Chichester archive dating from a later period. The parallels of wording in the seventh-century charter (S45) are detailed and discussed below under Chichester, where it is argued that the clauses concerned are genuine in Offa's charter and interpolations in the earlier document. On this basis the duplication is not a suspicious feature of Offa's charter, in which the wordings appear to be authentic.

A clause listing the components of the estate follows the first two interpolated Old English passages, and originally probably followed the name 'Bixlea'. The clause is typical of South Saxon charters of the time (cf. S49, 1184, etc.). There follows an immunity without exceptions which is of very doubtful validity. There is no parallel for it in South Saxon charters of the period, and similar clauses in Offa's charters are few (S116, 120, 123), none occurring in a text of undoubted authenticity. It is provided that the estate will revert to the see of Selsey after the death of the named beneficiary, bishop Oswald; this could be genuine or could be the work of a later writer who wished Selsey's right to the property to be more explicitly stated. The dating clause is in normal terms and the incarnational year 772 fits the 10th indiction;

the charter is also dated 15th August.

Some of the wording of the extant version of this charter is certainly spurious, and some details, notably the royal title, are doubtful, but it may well be that much of the text is that of an authentic charter of Offa which has been interpolated at a later date.

Offa is said to grant to bishop Oswald one estate of 8 hides at 'Bixlea', now Bexhill on the Sussex coast. The Old English passage describing the 'gavil-land' adds a further 20 hides to this. In 1066 Bexhill was owned by bishop 'Alric', that is Æthelric of Selsey, and was then assessed at 20 hides (DB Sussex, p. 9.11). Of the places named in the list of 'gavil-land', only one is mentioned in Domesday Book, this being Crowhurst which was not owned by the see of Selsey (DB Sussex, pp. 8.13, 9.13). In the charter Crowhurst is listed as an estate of 8 hides. The Domesday assessment of Bexhill therefore equals the total hidage of the charter less the hidage of the one area which had passed out of Selsey's possession by the time of the Conquest. The probability is that the Domesday manor included all the places mentioned in the charter except Crowhurst, and that the Old English passage listing the additional areas was added to the text at some time before the Conquest in order to bring the document into line with later circumstances.

Neither Bexhill nor any of the other places named in the charter appears in any other pre-Conquest charter, but there is a piece of pre-Conquest evidence which may have a bearing on this grant: in 771 Offa is reported as having subdued the people of Hastings (Historia Regum s.a.). Hastings is only about 6 miles along the coast from Bexhill, and it is probable that Bexhill lay within the Hastings territory, which was a separate entity from Sussex (EHD, p. 244, n. 5; Wormald 1983, p. 117 n. 76). It may be that Offa, in his grant to bishop Oswald of 772, was disposing of part of the land acquired by his conquest of the year before. A grant by Offa of an estate in this area in 772 seems

eminently plausible, and the account of the land makes more sense if it is regarded as a genuine grant of 8 hides later brought up to date by reference to additional areas than if it is supposed to be a fabrication.

A remarkable witness list is appended to this charter. The witnesses are listed below, identified and dated where possible, and with some reference to other evidence for the person concerned where this may be helpful:-

Offa, king of the Mercians (757-796).

Ecgberht, king of Kent; his extant charters (S34-7) establish that he was active from 765 to 779.

Iænberht, archbishop of Canterbury (765-792).

Cyniwulf, king of the West Saxons (757-786).

Eadberht, bishop of Leicester; consecrated in 764 (Historia Regum s.a.); attended the synod of Brentford in 781 (S1257).

Oswald, bishop of Selsey; attests charters of 765 and 770 (S48, 49).

Sigheah, bishop of London (MS Righeah); appears in no other charter, but is recorded in the episcopal list (Page 1966, p. 4); his predecessor attests in 766 (S107); his successor was at Brentford in 781.

Diora, bishop of Rochester; the beneficiary of three of king Ecgberht's charters (S35-7); was at the synod of Brentford.

Oswald, dux of the South Saxons; unknown, but possibly the 'Osiai rex' and 'Osa' of two charters of Ealdwulf, rex and dux of Sussex, dated by Sawyer c. 765 (S50) and 772 x 787 (S1183).

Osmund, dux of the South Saxons; probably the king of Sussex who made grants in 765 and 770 (S48, 49).

Ælfweald, dux (?) of the South Saxons; unknown but possibly the 'Ælhwald rex' of king Ealdwulf's charter of c. 765 (S50).

Oslac, dux of the South Saxons; donor of a charter of 780 (S1184).

Botwine, abbot of Medeshamstede; active at least from 765 to 779 (S34, 114, etc.).

Eata, Mercian layman (S65, 107, etc.).

Heahberht, unknown unless the king of Kent who attests charters of
Ecgberht of Kent and Offa (S34, 37, 105).

Brorda	}	Mercian laymen (S105, 107, 118, etc.).
Berhtwald		
Esne		
Hwityse		

Baldred, unknown.

Bryne, (?) Mercian layman (S144).

Stithberht, unknown unless the Mercian abbot (S106).

Cyne, unknown unless the Mercian layman Cian (S110, 111; Barker 1947,
p. 95 n. 30).

Ealdred, (?) Kentish layman (S29).

Lulling, (?) South Saxon layman (S50).

Berht, unknown.

Byrnhere, unknown.

Tota, unknown, unless a member of bishop Oswald's familia and later
bishop of Selsey (Page 1966, p. 4; B250).

Scira, unknown; but Birch suggests 'tota scira', the whole shire (B208,
p. 296 n. 2), (?) of the Hastingas.

Hemele, prefectus, West Saxon layman, active 762-786 (S261-4, 269).

The suggested identifications of some of the untitled witnesses are only very tentative, and it may be that there are several otherwise unrecorded persons here. It is scarcely within the bounds of possibility that a forger could have known the names of all these persons and drawn up this list, and the list may confidently be accepted as authentic. Moreover, all datable persons fit the date of the charter, 772.

The surviving version of Offa's charter may be divided into three parts: firstly the Old English passages which are certainly of later date; secondly the Latin text down to the witness list, which appears

to be genuine but is not beyond question and in which the rather dubious royal title and immunity suggest the possibility of some rewriting; and thirdly the witness list itself, which is authentic beyond any reasonable doubt and marred only by one or two minor copyist's errors. It therefore seems very likely that Offa did grant 8 hides at Bexhill to bishop Oswald in 772 and quite possible that this was part of the recently conquered Hastings territory. And it seems reasonably certain that the meeting recorded by the witness list did take place.

It is a reasonable assumption that this meeting, attended by the kings of Mercia, Wessex and Kent, the rulers of Sussex, the archbishop of Canterbury, four bishops and numerous other persons, was not convened for the sole purpose of witnessing a grant of land. There must have been other business which was of far greater importance at the time, but which, unlike the conveyance of land, did not give rise to any written record, and consequently there can be no certainty about the main purpose of this extraordinary assembly - extraordinary because there is no parallel in the surviving records of early Anglo-Saxon England for a peaceful meeting of the kings of three independent kingdoms. The degree of independence of Mercia enjoyed by Ecgberht of Kent is a subject of controversy, but his title and position in this list suggest that his status was distinctly different from that of the duces who were now the leading men of Sussex.

As noted above, this meeting occurred the year after Offa's conquest of the people of Hastings. It also seems to have more or less coincided with the demise of Sussex as an independent kingdom: kings of the South Saxons appear in most of the South Saxon charters pre-dating this document, but in none of those which post-date it (except possibly S50 which is undated but could date from c. 790, but is in any case a dubious text sharing much of the wording of S48 and having an odd witness list). The attendance at the meeting of 772 represents the political leaders of Sussex and of its three neighbouring kingdoms plus their supporters

and representatives of the church. Possibly the fate of Sussex and Hastings were discussed and some partition of territory agreed. The evidence for Offa's effective power in these areas and the preponderance at this meeting of Mercian and Mercian-dominated participants suggest that Wessex is likely to have gained very little.

* * * * *

S1258

Lambeth Palace, 1212, pp. 312-13 (microfilm)

(Edition: B291)

This charter, extant in a twelfth-century Canterbury manuscript (register P) as well as the thirteenth-century Lambeth Palace manuscript, and also in a sixteenth-century transcript (B.L., Cotton Claudius D ii) derives from the Council of Clofesho of 798, attended by Æthilheard, archbishop of Canterbury; Coenwulf, king of the Mercians; Cynithryth, abbess of Cookham and probably Offa's widow; and many others. There has been a long dispute over ownership of Cookham, which was finally resolved at this council on the basis that Cynithryth was confirmed in possession of the monastery and its estates while Christ Church gave up its claim but received some other property in compensation. As well as detailing the settlement terms, the text gives an extended account of the course of the dispute which lasted many years and involved several separate transactions.

This document has been accepted as authentic by Stenton (1913, pp. 24-5; 1955, pp. 13-14); by Whitelock, who provides a discussion and translation (EHD, no. 79); by Gelling, who gives a resumé of the events described in the text (ECTV, no. 16); and by Brooks, who furnishes a more detailed account of the content of the charter (Brooks 1984, pp. 103-4). It does not appear that any doubt of the charter's authenticity

can reasonably be entertained, and therefore no attempt will be made to discuss authenticity here, nor to provide a full account of the content, since this is readily available in the modern works cited above.

The chief importance of the document lies in its account of the successive changes of ownership of the monastery at Cookham during the second half of the eighth century, since from this narrative fluctuations in political power in the upper Thames Valley can be deduced. It is apparent that Æthilbald of Mercia controlled this area and that it was annexed after his death in 757 by Cyniwulf of Wessex, but later taken back into Mercian control by Offa, probably in 779 when he defeated Cyniwulf at Bensington, which is not far from Cookham (ASC s.a. 779). The information of the charter both confirms and adds to that of the Chronicle. It is also apparent from this account that the power and influence of the archbishop of Canterbury were somewhat limited. Both Cyniwulf and Offa seized property which rightfully belonged to the archiepiscopal see and retained it in disregard of protests from Canterbury. Cyniwulf is said to have restored the title-deeds of Cookham to Canterbury eventually because he repented of his conduct, but in fact his action probably derived, not from penitence, but from the fact that he no longer held the monastery and its deeds were of no further value to him. Moreover, the settlement terms permanently alienated from Canterbury the property which successive archbishops had repeatedly tried to recover. It appears that effective power lay with kings, not with the church.

* * * * *

S282

O.S. Facs., Vol. I, no. 7.

(Edition: B396)

A charter in the name of king Ecgberht of Wessex granting land

to a layman named Æthelric survives only on a single sheet of eleventh-century date in the archive of Canterbury. Brooks states that it is not authentic, without offering any arguments in support of this view, but accepts the witness list as genuine and dating from 830 (Brooks 1984, pp. 162, 358 n. 42). It seems quite possible, however, that the extant text is substantially authentic.

The date is placed at the beginning of the document immediately after the invocation and is given as 845, the 8th indiction. The incarnational year is impossible since it lay outside Ecgberht's reign, and has evidently been miscopied or miscalculated. Erroneous incarnational dates occur frequently in the charters of this archive and need not be considered to prejudice the authenticity of any individual text. The eighth indiction occurred in Ecgberht's reign in 815 and 830. The witness list suggests that the second of these is the correct date. The attestation of Ecgberht is followed by that of Æthelwulf, who is given the title 'rex Cantrariorum'; he can scarcely have acquired this title before the expulsion of Baldred, king of Kent, in the 820s (ASC s.a. 825; Coxe, Roger of Wendover, s.a. 827). Wulfred, archbishop of Canterbury, and Beornmod, bishop of Rochester, both had long episcopates including both the possible dates of this charter (ASC s.a. 804, 805, 832; S280). Ealhstan of Sherborne, however, was not consecrated as early as 815: he was appointed, according to the Chronicle, in 817, probably in fact in 824 (S283). Archdeacon Cyneheard is perhaps to be identified with the deacon of this name who attests in 824 and 825 (S1266, 1436; see also S1268 of uncertain date). Three laymen attest: of the first name only the initial H can be read; the second is Dudda, who died in 836 (ASC s.a.); and the last is Cynehelm who is not otherwise known. The witness list therefore dates from not earlier than the mid-820s and not later than 832, and it seems likely that the correct date of the charter is 830.

The land granted to Æthelric (who is not otherwise recorded) consists of 5 ploughlands at 'ƿerahorna', now Warehorne in Kent, and 'Flothammas', unidentified and otherwise unrecorded, but also probably in Kent. Warehorne was in the possession of Christ Church in the eleventh

century and was assessed at 1 ploughland in 1066 (Sl047, 1465, 1640; DB Kent, p. 3.19). It is a point in favour of this charter that the amount of land stated does not agree with the Domesday assessment and that the account of the land includes the unknown Flotham, which anyone forging a title-deed for Wareham would have had no reason to introduce.

This charter, relating to a Kentish estate, was evidently drawn up in Kent, probably at Canterbury, and substantially follows normal patterns of ninth-century Kentish diplomatic: there is no proem; Ecgberht's title is 'rex Occidentalium Saxonum necnon et Cantuariorum'; the dispositive verbs are 'dabo et concedo'; the beneficiary's rights are expressed in gerunds, 'ad [h]abendum et possidendum feliciterque in dies eius perfruendum ...' (Brooks 1984, pp. 327-8). Moreover, there are parallels in Kentish charters of the first half of the ninth century for the placing of the date at the beginning of the text (Sl88, 1434, 1436); the reference to the province in which the land is situated (Sl86, 187, 188); the immunity without exceptions (Sl65, 280, 323); the clause 'quamdiu cristiana fides in terra seruatur' (S323); the reference to the witnesses 'consentientibus ac scribentibus' (Sl86, 188, 1438); and the wording of the donor's attestation (Sl88, 289, 323). There occur sanctions which are not entirely dissimilar (Sl87, 188), and the additional clauses 'nisi ante digna satisfactione aemendare uoluerit' and 'manente . hac cartula in sua nihilominus firmitate roborata' are common (Sl87, 279, etc.).

The only detail whose authenticity seems very doubtful is a clause, mostly in Old English, which is placed at the end of the document after the witness list and states that Ecgberht sold the land to Æthelric in return for a payment of 50 mancusæ, and adds brief boundaries. This reads like a later endorsement rather than an integral part of the charter, and its information cannot be relied upon.

Otherwise the charter appears to be substantially genuine, and forms part of the charter evidence for West Saxon power in Kent, Æthelwulf's

status as king of Kent, and the relationship between the West Saxon kings and archbishop Wulfred in 830.

* * * * *

S270

B.L., Cotton Augustus II, no. 102

(Edition: B411)

A charter surviving on a single sheet of uncertain date records a grant of land, partly for salt, made by a king named Ecgberht to abbot Dunn of Lyminge in 773. The transaction is substantially duplicated in an original charter of king Æthilberht of Kent dated 732 (S23), and it seems that the alleged grant of Ecgberht is a spurious version of the charter of 732, and of no validity.

It is not entirely clear which king the author of this document intended to refer to. The date 773 suggests Ecgberht II of Kent; the witness list, which includes archbishop Ceolnoth and other churchman active in the ninth century, suggests Ecgberht of Wessex. The royal style 'rex Cantie necnon at aliarum gentium' is unparalleled and suits neither king; it is presumably the work of a forger who confused the two.

The property granted in each of these charters seems to be the same although the wording is different:-

S270: 'centum quinquaginta iugera ... in loco qui dicitur Sandtun
. et in eodem loco salicoquenda iuxta liminae . et in silua ubi
dicitur andred centum uiginti plaustra ad coquendum sal';

S23: 'quarta pars aratri unius iuxta Liminaee sali coquendo
accommoda';
'centum xx plaustra onusta de lignis ad coquendum sal';
'centum iugera eiusdem ruris in loco qui dicitur Sandtun'.

According to Stenton, the 150 acres of one account equal the quarter ploughland plus 100 acres of the other (Stenton 1918a, p. 65 n. 8).

There is a brief boundary clause giving landmarks on the four sides of the estate which is identical in each case. In both charters the grant is said to be made 'non pro pecunia sed pro remedio animae meae'.

And the beneficiary appears to be the same abbot:-

S270: 'ad aeclesiam beatae genetricis dei et domini nostri Ihesu Cristi et Dunne abb' suisque sociis';

S23: 'tuo abba presbyter Dun ... et ecclesiæ beatæ Mariæ'.

The chief content of the charter in the name of Ecgberht therefore duplicates that of Æthilberht's charter, and appears to have been borrowed from it.

The witness list is anachronistic. It begins with several names which could have originated in a charter of the reign of Ecgberht of Wessex: king Ecgberht; Ceolnoth, archbishop of Canterbury (833-870); bishops Beornmod of Rochester, Ealhstan of Sherborne and Cynered of Selsey (the career of the last is not datable, but he was active in 839: S1438); and the laymen Osmod, who died in 836 (ASC s.a.) and Wulfheard who died in 840 (ASC s.a.). The remaining names, although their presence in a list of 833 x 836 cannot be shown to be impossible, probably derive from a slightly later source: Eanwulf and Bofa were companions of Æthelwulf, first appearing in 838 and 839 respectively (S280, 287); an abbot Drihtnoth is not otherwise recorded, but it may well be that this man is to be identified with the priest of this name who attests in 841 (S291); surviving attestations of abbot Freodoric date from the 840s (S293, 1439); the deacon Heahberht does appear in the 830s, but always in witness lists consisting of the Christ Church community (S1438, 1482, etc.); Beornmod and Heahnoth are otherwise unknown; Oshere, Ealhhere and Lulla were companions of Æthelwulf (S287, 299, etc.). The witness list appears to be a compilation, some of the names deriving from a document of the 830s but others more likely to have originated in a source of the 840s.

The oddities and anachronisms of this document, in conjunction with the fact that the transaction and some of the wording are duplicated in an earlier, genuine charter suggest that this is a fabrication based on the charter of Æthilberht II of Kent. The later history of the land is unknown. Sandtun is identified with Sampton, now lost, in West Hythe, Kent, and does not occur in pre-Conquest sources outside these two charters or in Domesday Book, so the motive for the forgery is not clear. Just possibly the intention was to strengthen the claim of Lyminge, or Canterbury, to the land at some time after the West Saxon annexation of Kent by making it appear that the property was acquired by the authority of Ecgberht, king of the West Saxons, rather than by that of an early Kentish king.

* * * * *

S323 and S1623

S323: Edition B407.

S1623: Lambeth Palace 1212, pp. 319-20 (microfilm).

Edition B408.

A grant of various properties to Christ Church made by Æthelwulf in his capacity as king of Kent with the consent of Ecgberht, king of the West Saxons, survives in two Canterbury cartularies of the thirteenth century, Registers A and E (Davis 1958, nos. 169, 168). The charter seems to be genuine and was accepted as such by Brooks (1984, p. 145 and n. 54). S1623 is another version of the same grant, very much abbreviated, making little attempt to reproduce the wording of the full version, and apparently intended as a brief summary of the transaction. There survive similar short versions of various other Canterbury charters (S155, 160, 286, 1438, etc.).

The text includes no date except in the short version where an incarnational year of 832 is stated and in the rubric at the head of the fuller version which mentions 841. These dates seem to represent guesswork by cartularists and neither can be correct. Archbishop Ceolnoth, who attests, was not consecrated until 833 (ASC s.a.), and the consent of Ecgberht, king of the West Saxons, to the grant is stated, so the charter dates from his reign, i.e. not later than 839. The death of another witness, the layman Dudda, is recorded in 836 (ASC s.a.), so the charter apparently dates from c.833 x c. 836.

Æthelwulf appears in three other charters as king of Kent (S279, 282, 286) and one of these, like the present document, is a grant made by Æthelwulf in this capacity with the consent of Ecgberht (S286). Three of the charters include an immunity without exceptions (S282, 286, 323), and two of them refer to a situation continuing as long as the Christian faith survives (S282, 323). The account of the property granted in this charter has some echoes in Æthelwulf's other grant (S286); a similar list of the components of the property is given; both use the term iugera in indicating the size of an area of land; both mention cattle and rights of common pasture; both provide brief details of boundaries in Old English; the authenticity of the boundary clause in the other charter is perhaps doubtful, but in the present text these are not presented as a continuous passage, but occur as separate phrases which have some appearance of being used because the author's Latinity was not equal to his task; this is consistent with an early ninth-century date when Latinity at Christ Church was at a low ebb. The text is unusual in having no sanction, but it contains no identifiable anachronisms and is probably substantially, if not entirely, genuine.

The identity of the beneficiary is never explicitly stated, but it is clearly a religious community since the donor asks for the prayers of the congregation, and may be assumed to be Christ Church. This is

not a detail which a forger would have omitted. The witness list has been abbreviated to three subscriptions, those of Æthelwulf, archbishop Ceolnoth and Dudda, plus a note that there were many others. The three surviving names are quite acceptable and the attestation forms normal.

Æthelwulf grants a collection of properties including pastures, meadows, woods, livestock and a vill at Canterbury. The account includes many place-names which do not now survive. The short version of the charter includes a slightly different account including a few additional place-names, but probably relates to exactly the same areas of land. The rubric of the fuller version refers to the property as 'Ebbeni', that is Ebony on the Isle of Oxney, and Brooks sums up the grant as relating to 'a whole complex of estates on the edge of the Weald and in Romney Marsh' (Brooks 1984, p. 145). The amounts of land are not specified except in the case of the vill at Canterbury. Neither Ebony nor Oxney is named in Domesday Book, nor can any of this group of estates be identified with later manors. This is a point in favour of the charter, since it seems that there was no motive for forging a grant of this property.

This charter seems to be genuine and, with other evidence, indicates that Æthelwulf had the title king of Kent in the 830s, as other sons of West Saxon kings did in later years, and that he acted as ruler of this annexed province under the overall authority of Ecgberht.

* * * * *

S286

Lambeth Palace, 1212, p. 392 (microfilm)

(Edition: B419, 420)

The other extant charter recording a grant made by Æthelwulf as king of Kent also survives in long and short versions, the former

in a thirteenth-century Christ Church cartulary and the latter copied in a number of manuscripts of the twelfth century and later. Æthelwulf grants land near Lyminge to archbishop Ceolnoth. The charter seems to be genuine and is accepted as such by Brooks (1984, p. 145).

The document is dated by incarnation year, indiction, day of the week and day of the month; all of these are consistent and indicate the 19th November 838. There is an early ninth-century parallel for such detailed dating (S1431). The witness list appears to be authentic and is consistent with the date. It contains the subscriptions of Æthelwulf, archbishop Ceolnoth, the layman Hereberht and several men described as abbots, priests and deacons. Most of these witnesses appear in other lists dated to this period and evidently consisting in whole or in part of members of the Christ Church community (S287, 1438, 1482). Ceolwulf, described here as deacon should probably be identified with the subdeacon who appears in these other lists: he may have become a deacon, or his title may have been miscopied. The deacon Duduc is not otherwise recorded, and it may be that the title given to him is wrong, as there was a layman of this name in Æthelwulf's entourage (S271, 289, 315, etc.).

The wording includes an Old English boundary clause which may be a later addition or translation: boundary clauses were certainly being drawn up within a decade of this grant (S298), but the evidence suggests that in Kent bounds were still being written in Latin at this time (S186-8, 279, 293, 297). The rest of the wording is probably authentic. Resemblances to Æthelwulf's slightly earlier grant to Christ Church (S323) are noted above. There are no identifiable anachronisms, and several of the formulas are typical of Canterbury charters of this time, for example the series of gerunds defining the beneficiary's powers over the estate, 'Ad habendum et possidendum .. perfruendum ... dereliquendum' and the sanction (Brooks 1984, pp. 328-9).

Æthelwulf grants to archbishop Ceolnoth one mansio at 'Eastrestadelham' and 7 iugera adjacent to the church of St. Mary at Lyminge. The name Eastrestadelham does not survive, but it seems probable that this area of land lay near to the other, possibly adjacent to it, and that all the land was in the vicinity of Lyminge. It is impossible to be certain whether this estate is to be equated in whole or in part with Christ Church's Domesday manor of Lyminge (DB Kent, p. 2.26); the latter is likely to have included the actual site of the monastery at Lyminge.

The document seems to be authentic and may be regarded as part of the evidence for the West Saxons in Kent in the 830s, their relationship with Christ Church, and Æthelwulf's status as king of Kent.

* * * * *

S1438

B.L., Cotton Augustus II, 20, 21, and 37.

(Editions: B421; short version B422)

This important charter survives in three contemporary manuscripts, all of which may be regarded as originals, and in full or short versions in various later manuscripts. It records a number of transactions reflecting final agreement between the West Saxon kings Ecgberht and Æthelwulf on one hand and archbishop Ceolnoth and his community on the other, concerning more than one source of dispute. The document is considered in detail by Brooks who provides a description of the contemporary manuscripts and a plausible reconstruction of the circumstances in which they were written (Brooks 1984, pp. 323-5), and discusses the content of the charter, the implications of the various transactions involved, and the importance of the document as evidence for the history of this period and in particular for the relationship between the West Saxon kings and the see of Canterbury

(pp. 145-7). No discussion of this charter will therefore be offered here.

(c) Conclusions

The two charters purporting to date from the reign of Ceadwalla (S230, 1610) are both spurious and provide no information about early Wessex. One of the charters in the name of Ecgberht also appears to be forged (S270). The remaining charters described above all seem to be genuine in whole or in part. The two earliest (S108, 1258) tell us something of the relations between Wessex and the kingdoms on its borders in the reign of Cyniwulf, although the first of these charters is rather more intriguing than informative.

The remaining charters relate to Kent in the 830s when West Saxon power had been established in the area by king Ecgberht. The subject has been dealt with by Brooks and will not therefore be discussed here.

2. ROCHESTER

	<u>Page</u>
(a) <u>Introduction</u>	440
(b) <u>The Charters</u>	440
<u>S</u>	
271	440
280	445
(c) <u>Conclusions</u>	450

(a) Introduction

Rochester is one of the two archives which have so far been edited in the new series of Anglo-Saxon charters which is being produced under the auspices of the British Academy (Campbell, Rochester Cart.), and the editor provides a useful introduction to the material. The cartulary in which most of the charters survive has also been published in facsimile with an introductory account (Sawyer, Textus Roffensis). The availability of these fairly recent works precludes the necessity for an account of the archive here.

(b) The Charters

Only two Rochester charters claim to relate directly to early Wessex, these being two grants to the see in the name of Ecgberht, king of the West Saxons, both dated to the period of West Saxon rule in Kent.

<u>S</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Donor</u>	<u>Beneficiary</u>
271	(828)	Ecgerht, king	St. Andrew's, Rochester
280	838	Ecgerht, king	Beornmod, bishop

S271

Sawyer, Textus Roffensis, fos. 137r-138v.

(Edition: Campbell, Rochester Cart., no. 18)

A charter which purports to record a grant of privileges to Rochester made by king Ecgerht in the 820s survives only in the Textus Roffensis. The document seems to be a fabrication.

Ecgerht is described in both the dispositio and the witness list as 'rex Anglorum'. He is not given this title in any other record,

and it is highly unlikely that it could be genuine. It was probably introduced into this document in the tenth century when it was the usual royal style. There is a reference to the king's son, Æthelwulf, 'quem regem constituimus in Cantia'. It is true that Æthelwulf was made king of Kent, but there is no other example of such a statement. Æthelwulf simply appears elsewhere with the appropriate title, and this explanation of his position seems a little dubious. The dispositive verb displays an early spelling, 'donabi' for donauī, but is nevertheless suspect because at Rochester in this period dispositive verbs are always in the present or future tense. The only parallels for this form among Rochester charters are a Kentish grant of 738 (S27) and an original of 987 (S864). The past tense is unlikely to be genuine in a Rochester charter of the early ninth century.

The immunity granted in this charter incorporates a detailed wording setting out the particular obligations from which all the Rochester estates are to be freed. These obligations include the provision of hospitality to the king and his leading men, and to persons in charge of horses and hounds or hawks and falcons, and to the men known as fæstingmen, who were perhaps royal servants normally entitled to claim lodgings in districts where they had business (EHD, no. 83, p. 515 n. 1). Immunities detailing these obligations are a feature of Mercian charters of the mid-ninth century. The earliest is a grant of king Coenwulf to Abingdon dated 821, interpolated but probably authentic at least as far as this passage is concerned (S183), and a similar wording occurs in a charter of the following year in which king Ceolwulf grants land in Kent to archbishop Wulfred (S186 - original). Immunities of the same basic type but with varying amounts of detail occur during the reigns of Wiglaf and Berhtwulf (S188, 190, 1271), and the latest instance is in a charter of king Burgred dated 855 (S207). The Rochester immunity and some of the similar ones are quoted below:-

- S271: 'ut omnes agros sint libera ab omni regali seruitio .
a pastu regum et principum . ducum et prefectum exactorumque .
ab equorum et falconum accipitrumque et canum acceptione . et
illorum hominum refectione quod nos festingmenn nominamus
a parafrithis . et ab omnibus difficultatibus regalis uel
secularis seruitutis notis et ignotis . cum furis comprehensione
intus et foris maioris minorisue . preter pontis constructione
et expeditione . eternaliter liberata permaneat .';
- S183: 'ut nullus superueniat hominum superbia inflatus . nec rex suum
pastum requirat uel habentes hominum quos nos dicimus fæstingmen
nec eos qui accipitres portant uel falcones uel caballos ducunt
sive canes';
- S186: 'insuper etiam hanc predictam terram liberabo . ab omni
seruitute secularium rerum a pastu regis episcopis principum .
seu prefectum exactorum . ducorum . canorum . uel æquorum seu
accipitrum ab refectione et habitu illorum omnium qui dicuntur
fæstingmen ab omnibus laboribus operibus . et oneribus . sive
difficultatibus . quit plus minuere numerabo uel dico . ab omni
grauitatibus maioribus minoriis . notis ignotis undique liberata
permaneat in æfum nisi is quattuor causis que nunc nominabo .
expeditione contra paganos ostes . et pontes constructione seu
arcis munitione uel destructione';
- S1271: 'ut sint liberati a pastu principum et a difficultate illa quot
nos Saxonice dicimus festigmen nec homines illuc mittant qui
osceptros uel falcones portant aut canes aut cabellos ducunt sed
sint liberati perpetualiter in eum';
- S207: 'liberam a pastu omnium accipitrum et falconum in Mercensium
et omnium venatorum regis vel principis . similiter et pastu
hominum illorum quos saxonice nominamus . alhfæreld et heora
fæsting . et ealra angelcynnes monna . et æl þeodigra ræde
fæstinge . tam nobilium quam ignobilium . istorum omnium sint
liberati'.

This type of wording seems to have been a Mercian phenomenon, introduced into Kentish charter writing during the period of Mercian rule in Kent. There is no obvious reason why it should not have continued in use after the West Saxons gained control of Kent, but in fact this does not seem to have happened. With the single exception of the Rochester charter in the name of Ecgberht, there is no immunity of this type in any Kentish charter of Ecgberht or Æthelwulf, and among charters of other areas there is only one instance of such a wording in a charter in the name of a West Saxon king, this being the dubious grant of privileges to Abingdon in the name of Ecgberht in which the immunity agrees word for word with that of a charter of king Coenwulf of Mercia and has probably

been borrowed from it (S278, cf. S183). The evidence therefore suggests that such immunities were always exclusively Mercian, and that this passage cannot be regarded as an authentic part of a charter of Ecgberht of Wessex.

There follows a passage which is evidently designed to strengthen the authority of the charter and refers to bishop Beornmod, St. Andrew and St. Paulinus, and the text includes both a blessing and a sanction. It is impossible to demonstrate that either of these is anachronistic in a charter of Ecgberht, but the nearest to parallels for the wordings occur in charters of Æthelwulf of the late 830s and early 840s (S287 - blessing; S291, 293 - sanction).

It seems likely that this text is a compilation in which an immunity from a Mercian charter (perhaps dating from the period of Mercian rule in Kent) is combined with the name of Ecgberht of Wessex; a royal title which came into use in the tenth century; the reservation of exceptions which do not otherwise occur in Rochester charters before 850 (S299; Brooks 1984, p. 329); and a blessing and sanction which probably derive from a charter of Æthelwulf's reign. The immunity is said to be applicable to all Rochester estates, so that the charter purports to record a general grant of privileges to the see made in the early years of West Saxon rule in Kent. The document is probably a fabrication with no authentic basis.

The dating clause is worded quite normally, but the dates are inconsistent, 823 and the 6th indiction. The latter occurred during Ecgberht's reign in 813 and 828. Whitelock plausibly suggests that the year should be 828 and that u has been accidentally omitted from Dccc . xxuiii by a copyist (cited in S271). This seems more likely than that the year 823 has been borrowed from the Chronicle, as Stanton implied (1918a, p. 65 n. 7), since the clause is followed by several attestations apparently derived from a West Saxon charter of c. 825

x 832, and it may well be that the dating clause and these subscriptions originated in the same charter. The witnesses are king Ecgberht, Æthelwulf described as rex, archbishop Wulfred (805-832), bishops Wigthehn of Winchester, Ealhstan of Sherborne and Beornmod of Rochester, and four laymen who are all recorded elsewhere as active during Ecgberht's reign, Wulfheard (S280, 283; ASC s.a. 840), Monnede (S273, etc.), Osmod (ASC s.a. 836), and Dudda (S282, 323; ASC s.a. 836). Precise dating of the careers of the laymen is not possible, but it does seem likely that all these men were active in 828. The wording of Ecgberht's subscription is acceptable apart from the title 'rex Anglorum', and the other men attest in the form 'consensi et subscripsi'.

There follows a further series of witnesses, distinguished from the first by including no subscription wordings but consisting simply of a list of names with crosses. Most of these men seem to have been active at a later date than 828. Aldred is unknown unless he is to be identified with a witness of a charter of king Æthelberht of 860 (S327). Æthelwulf and Æthelheard had begun to attest before the end of Ecgberht's reign (S280), but they are known chiefly as supporters of Æthelwulf, while Oshere, Duduc, Boba and Ealhhere are otherwise recorded only in this role (S287, 289, 1438, etc.). The remaining witness, Sigesteb, does not appear in any other charter, but he is perhaps to be identified with a Canterbury moneyer, 'Sigestef', who struck coins for Ecgberht in the late 820s (Blunt 1957, pp. 468-72). There is a possible parallel for the attestation of a charter by a moneyer: a man named Osmund appears with king Æthelwulf in the Wilton witness list of 839 appended to the Kingston agreement of 838 (S1438), and there was a moneyer of this name who struck coins at Canterbury during most of Æthelwulf's reign (Dolley and Skaare, 1961, pp. 70-3). The witness list therefore appears to be a conflation of two lists, one deriving from a charter of the reign of Ecgberht, perhaps of 828, and the other

originating in a charter of Æthelwulf.

It seems clear that the compiler of this document made use of authentic ninth-century records, and elements from these survive in the document he produced, but this document itself appears to be a fabrication.

* * * * *

S280

B.L., Cotton Charter viii, 30.

(Edition: Campbell, Rochester Cart., no. 19)

A charter in which king Ecgberht grants land to bishop Beormod of Rochester in 838 survives on a single sheet of the late tenth century and in the Textus Roffensis. Considered independently, the document seems to be substantially genuine, but a certain amount of circumstantial evidence renders it rather suspect. This evidence is further considered below, but first the text will be examined.

The charter is extremely brief and is unusual in having no sanction. It may well be, as the editor suggests, that it has been abbreviated (Campbell, Rochester Cart., p. xxiii). Ecgberht's title is given simply as rex, which is unusual at this date, but may itself be an instance of abbreviation, and similarly Æthelwulf appears as rex where one might expect rex Cantie or rex Cantuariorum. The witness list consists only of names and titles, with no fuller attestation forms; this was a tenth-century practice and occasionally appears in copies of earlier documents (e.g. S291), evidently by abbreviation of the original wording. The text follows standard Rochester diplomatic of the time in using the dispositive verb 'dabo', in describing the beneficiary's rights over the estate in a clause beginning 'ut habeat et possideat ...'; and in including an immunity without exceptions (Brooks 1984, pp. 328-9).

There is another instance of a grant by Ecgberht in which the consent of Æthelwulf is specified (S279). It appears that, while some clauses may have been omitted or shortened by a copyist, the wording which survives is basically authentic.

The surviving copies preserve an early spelling of the king's name, 'Ecgbearhtus', and also some other instances of archaic orthography, 'debotissimo' for deuotissimo; 'serbitia' for seruitia; and 'bica' for uica. These suggest that the tenth-century copyist had an early exemplar.

There are two dating clauses: the first, placed immediately after the invocation, dates the charter 838, 1st indiction, which are consistent and both probably genuine; the second, placed near the end of the text, begins in the usual Rochester manner, 'Scripta est ...', and states the place where the charter was written. There are parallels in Kentish charters of the early ninth century for the inclusion of two dating clauses (S40, 163, 188), and both are likely to be authentic.

According to the second of these clauses, the charter was written at the royal vill named 'Frericburna'. An earlier charter dated from the same place states that it was in Surrey (S144; Campbell, Rochester Cart., p. 64 under Frericburna). The witness list informs us that the assembly which met at Frericburna in 838 consisted of kings Ecgberht and Æthelwulf; archbishop Ceolnoth; bishops Beornmod of Rochester, Ealhstan of Sherborne, Eadhun of Winchester, Cynered of Selsey and Ceolberht of London; and six laymen, Wulfheard, Æthelwulf, Eanwulf, Hereberht, Æthelwulf and Æthelheard, of whom the first five are given the title dux. There is independent evidence not only that many of these men were active at this time, but that at least some of them attended a meeting at a royal residence in Surrey in 838. The Canterbury record, extant in three contemporary manuscripts, of the council held at Kingston, Surrey, in 838 does not include a witness list deriving from that meeting,

but does mention that it was attended by archbishop Ceolnoth, numerous bishops, kings Ecgberht and Æthelwulf and all their leading men (S1438). Moreover, a Winchester charter which may itself be spurious but which clearly derives from a genuine charter relating to the council of Kingston (S281), contains an abbreviated witness list consisting of the first seven names appearing in the Rochester text. The indications are that the same assembly met at Frericburna and at Kingston, perhaps moving from one royal residence to another and conducting business at each. Or it may be that Frericburna is to be identified with Kingston and that one writer used the old stream name while others referred to the place by the phrase cyninges tun which gave rise to the modern name.

The six laymen named in the Rochester charter may reasonably be assumed to have been among the lay supporters of the West Saxon kings at Kingston. Moreover, four of them, Wulfheard, Æthelwulf, Eanwulf and Æthelheard, attended king Æthelwulf at Wilton in 839 when he confirmed the Kingston agreement (S1438). Wulfheard assisted Æthelwulf in the takeover of Kent in the 820s (ASC s.a. 825) and was also involved in the struggle against the Vikings in the 840s (ASC s.a. 840), as were Eanwulf (ASC s.a. 845) and Hereberht (ASC s.a. 841). The second Æthelwulf may be an accidental duplication, or there could have been a second ealdorman who bore this common name. The order in which the witnesses attest is perfectly normal, although in using Campbell's edition this has to be deduced by careful reading of the footnotes. This witness list has every appearance of authenticity.

Ecgberht is said to grant 4 ploughlands, aratra, of land at 'Snoddingland' and 'Holanbeorge', now Snodland and Holborough, which are situated close together and about 5 miles from Rochester. Some further property is detailed in a clause which is placed at the end of the text immediately above the witness list - a mill on the stream at Holborough, the right to gather wood, swine pastures in four places, and a village near Rochester.

The editor regards this as a later addition (Campbell, Rochester Cart., p. xxiii), and he is probably right. The placing of the information is difficult to account for on any other assumption; it separates the reference to the witnesses' names from the actual subscriptions, and it forms a non-sequitur which makes no sense grammatically. It is not impossible that this was an afterthought added by the original scribe when the charter was first drawn up, but it may have been appended to the charter much later. This clause must be considered dubious, but the rest of the text seems authentic and it is scarcely possible that the witness list was invented.

However, as mentioned above, there are certain considerations which render this charter rather suspect. In the first place, it has been suggested fairly recently that the high reputation which the Rochester archive has long enjoyed may not in fact be justified. Simon Keynes argues that the overall picture presented by the pre-Conquest charters of Rochester, which is of a Domesday endowment substantially acquired by direct royal grant, much of it in the eighth and ninth centuries, is scarcely plausible, and that there must have been a certain amount of tampering with the evidence to produce this picture; it may be that in some cases authentic charters have been transcribed with only the name of the estate changed (Keynes 1976, pp. 187-93). Keynes' arguments seem convincing, and mean that all Rochester charters are suspect, since the sort of interpolation which may have taken place is virtually undetectable, and the fact that the general pattern is implausible gives no indication of which individual charters have been altered.

Another consideration, of particular relevance to the charter of Ecgbert, is that there was a dispute over ownership of Snodland in the late tenth century. The estate was bequeathed to Rochester by a layman named Ælhere in the mid tenth century, and the dispute, which continued almost to the end of the century, arose out of efforts by

various members of Ælfhere's family to secure the land for themselves, repudiating or ignoring Rochester's claims (for detailed accounts see S1456-7, 1511; Whitelock, Wills, pp. 128-9; Campbell, Rochester Cart., pp. xx-xxi and a forthcoming paper on dispute settlement by C.P. Wormald). Frequent reference is made in the surviving accounts to the use of the title deeds for Snodland.

On the face of it, a grant by Ecgberht was irrelevant to the dispute, since Rochester's title to the estate originated in Ælfhere's bequest. But Ecgberht's charter survives on a single sheet of late tenth-century date, and it seems overwhelmingly likely that this manuscript was written at that time for use in the dispute (Keynes 1976, pp. 204-5), and therefore that evidence of a grant by Ecgberht was considered helpful to Rochester. One may compare the Winchester archive in which the church's title to many of its estates is supported by charters purporting to record successive grants by several kings over a period of centuries.

The editor suggests that the estate granted by Ecgberht was probably not the same as the one with which the dispute was concerned, since the latter was still in private hands in the tenth century (Campbell, Rochester Cart., p. xx). But this implies that the copying of this charter at just the time of the dispute was pure coincidence, which seems unlikely. In the records of the dispute, the estate is called simply Snodland; the area is not stated, and there are no bounds. In 1066 Snodland was owned by Rochester and assessed at 6 sulungs (DB Kent, p. 4.9). This manor may well have incorporated the smaller estate at Snodland and Holborough said to be granted by Ecgberht. Holborough is not mentioned in Domesday Book. It is the subject of a charter recording a grant by Æthelwulf to bishop Beornmod in 841 of 2 ploughlands (S289). This might relate to an adjacent area and be supplementary to Ecgberht's grant. Or an interpolator, converting Ecgberht's charter into a title deed for Snodland, may have thought it useful also to name the nearby

estate of Holborough, and may have borrowed this name from Æthelwulf's charter

It seems very likely that this document is at least based on an authentic charter of Ecgberht and that the text and witness list are substantially genuine. But it is quite possible that the charter originally recorded a different transaction, and that the name of the beneficiary and/or of the estate have been interpolated in the surviving copy.

The charter may at least be accepted as evidence of the meeting held at Frericburna in Surrey in 838.

(c) Conclusions

There seems little doubt that these two charters are both based at least in part on authentic charters of Ecgberht, but there is no certainty about the content of these sources. They may have been grants to lay beneficiaries or to other churches, of lands which later came into Rochester's possession with the relevant documentation, or they may have been grants wholly irrelevant to Rochester and merely deposited there for safe keeping. There is no clear evidence for patronage of Rochester by the West Saxon rulers of Kent during Ecgberht's reign, but it may be that he did grant Snodland and Holborough to the see.

3. ST. AUGUSTINE'S, CANTERBURY

	<u>Page</u>
(a) <u>Introduction</u>	452
(b) <u>The Charter</u>	452

(a) Introduction

The abbey of St. Augustine's, Canterbury, was one of the oldest religious establishments in England, being founded as the monastery of St. Peter and St. Paul by St. Augustine. The charters in its archive purporting to date from the early seventh century, however, are spurious (Levison 1946, pp. 174-233), the earliest authentic charters dating from the late seventh century (S10, etc.).

The principal manuscripts containing the charters of St. Augustine's are two cartularies, now British Library, Cotton Julius D ii and Public Records Office, E164/27, each written in successive hands of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries (Davis 1958, nos. 192, 195). In both cases the section containing the pre-Conquest charters dates from the thirteenth century. It was remarked in 1915 that these volumes have never been critically examined (Turner 1915, p. xv), and this is still the case. It is not clear which is the earlier manuscript, or what is the relationship between them, and a detailed examination of the cartularies is beyond the scope of the present work.

(b) The Charter

S279

B.L., Cotton Julius D ii, fo. 132rv.

(Edition: B852)

Only one charter in the archive of St. Augustine's relates to early Wessex, this being a grant of land made by Ecgberht in 836 to Ciaba, a clerk of St. Augustine's, with reversion to the house. The document survives in the two thirteenth-century cartularies, and appears to be genuine.

The wording is quite normal and uses several formulas mentioned by Brooks as typical of ninth-century Canterbury diplomatic: the dispositive

verbs 'dabo et concedo'; the usual series of gerunds defining the beneficiary's rights over the property; the immunity with three exceptions; and the dating clause beginning 'Actum est' (Brooks 1984, pp. 328-9). The king's title is 'rex Occidentalium Saxonum' and here, as in other charters of the 830s, Æthelwulf is described as king of Kent (cf. S282, 286, 323). The boundary clause is in Latin, as is the case in other Kentish charters of the time (S187, 293, 297, etc.), and like some others refers to common pasture for cattle (S286, 323). The date is given as an incarnational year and an indiction; these are consistent and both are probably genuine.

In one manuscript (Cotton Julius D ii) the last sentence of the charter refers to witnesses 'quorum hic nomina subterius in cedula probabiliter continentur'; no witness list is transcribed. The other manuscript (P.R.O., E 164/27) omits the word probabiliter and adds two subscriptions in the names of Ecgberht (his name is actually omitted but his title is given) and Æthelwulf; the wordings of these subscriptions are quite normal and they appear authentic. It has been suggested that the word probabiliter may have been introduced by the copyist to warn readers that the transcript of the witness list was of doubtful accuracy, probably because the exemplar was in poor condition (Turner 1915, p. xxxiii). He then presumably decided that a transcript could not even be attempted. The absence of the word from the other manuscript lends some support to this theory, as does the omission of Ecgberht's name from the subscription in this manuscript, which may indicate that this copyist also found the exemplar difficult to read. The term cedula suggests that the witness list was written on a separate piece of membrane (cf. S163, 293), and it may well be that this was no longer clearly legible.

The land granted, or rather sold, to Ciaba, who paid 100 mancusae for it, is described as one aratrum in the place called 'Scirdun' which does not recur in pre-Conquest charters and remains unidentified. The

charter provides that the land is to be held by Ciaba for his lifetime and is then to pass into the possession of St. Augustine's. The text mentions that this estate formerly belonged to the royal vill at Canterbury. Motive for forgery of a grant of this estate cannot be demonstrated, nor is a forger likely to have invented the obscure clerk Ciaba, who is not otherwise recorded. The content and the wording seem alike to indicate that the document is authentic.

This charter forms part of the evidence for the takeover of Kent by the West Saxons during the latter part of Ecgberht's reign. It shows Æthelwulf having the title king of Kent and ruling the area jointly with his father. The agreement to transfer a portion of land from the royal property into the possession of a Kentish cleric was probably part of the process of securing the support of the church in Kent for the West Saxon royal house, also apparent in transactions with Christ Church. It appears both here and in Christ Church documentation that individual members of a religious community could possess personal property which might amount to considerable wealth.

4. CHICHESTER

	<u>Page</u>
(a) <u>Introduction</u>	456
(b) <u>The Charters</u>	457
S45	457

(a) Introduction

When it was decided in the early eighth century that the province of the South Saxons, hitherto included in the West Saxon diocese, should have a bishop of its own, the episcopal see was established at Selsey where a monastery, founded by Wilfrid, had already existed for some 20 to 30 years. Eadberht, abbot of the monastery, was consecrated as first bishop of the see (HE V 18). Following his episcopate and that of his successor, Eolla, there was a vacancy, so that in 731 the bishop of Winchester was once more responsible for the South Saxons (HE V 23), but in 733 Sigifrith was consecrated to the see of Selsey (Historia Regum , s.a.). This was not the last vacancy to occur at Selsey, but there seems to be no doubt of the basic continuity of the establishment from the time of Wilfrid's foundation onwards. Shortly after the Conquest the see was moved to Chichester as part of a general policy of relocating remote or rural sees in more convenient, urban situations (Stenton 1971, p. 666).

The pre-Conquest charters surviving in the archive of Chichester are therefore primarily (perhaps exclusively) the records of the monastery and see of Selsey. Two early charters relating to Sussex survive in the archive of Christ Church, Canterbury (S50, 108). Otherwise all documents which may be described as South Saxon charters are included among the Chichester records.

Most of these charters survive in a cartulary which was made for W. Reade, bishop of Chichester 1368-1385. This is now Manuscript Ep. VI/1/2 in the West Sussex Record Office at Chichester (Davis 1958, no. 235). A few charters also survive in other medieval manuscripts, and there are two single sheets, one of the tenth century, the charter concerned being a very dubious document dated to the early eighth century (S43) and the other an original of the late eighth century (S1184; Rogers 1981). In the latter case the accuracy of the cartularist's transcription

can be checked very easily by comparing the two editions provided by Birch, one from the single sheet and the other from the cartulary (B1334, 237). Discrepancies between the two texts are very minor, and the only notable alteration made in the fourteenth-century transcript is the abbreviation of the witness lists. It therefore appears that the cartularist copied his exemplar with substantial accuracy, as far as this can be deduced from the evidence of a single document.

(b) The Charters

Only two of the early charters in this archive are, or claim to be, of direct relevance to Wessex. The first of these purports to be a grant of Ceadwalla to bishop Wilfrid in 683 (sic) of Selsey and various other estates for the foundation of a monastery (S232). This document is mentioned above in connection with the related Canterbury charter (S230). Brooks has established that both are tenth-century fabrications having no authentic basis and no relevance to early Wessex, and the Chichester document will not therefore be further discussed here.

* * * * *

S45

West Sussex Record Office, Ep. VI/1/2, fo. 16v. (photocopy)

(Edition: B78)

The other charter is a grant by Nothhelm, king of the South Saxons, to his sister Nothgyth of lands for the foundation of a monastery, and is dated 692. The document is of interest from a West Saxon point of view because of the West Saxons who appear in its witness list. The text presents some problems but is probably basically authentic. It survives only in the fourteenth-century cartulary.

Much of the wording of the charter appears to be genuine. The king's title, 'Rex Suthsaxonum', has parallels in other early South Saxon charters which appear to be basically authentic (S42, 46; also 'dux Suthsaxonum' in S1173). There is a clause which noticeably echoes a proem found in three early charters of south-east England:-

S45: 'sciens mihi in futuro prodissse quicquid cristi menbris
de mea propria possessione impendo';

S235: 'Quocienscumque aliquid pro opere pietatis cristi menbris
impendimus nostre anime fore prodesse credimus quia sua
illi reddimus non nostra largimur';

see also S1165, 1171.

In Nothhelm's charter, as in Ceadwalla's grant of Farnham and several other very early charters, the beneficiary is addressed in the second person, 'tibi Nothgide sorori' (see S235). The dispositive words 'libenter dabo' are probably genuine: cf. 'libenter concedo' (S1173), 'dabo' (S42). The clause listing the components of the estate seems to have been a standard feature of early South Saxon charter-writing (cf. S42, 46, 1184, etc.). The attestation forms are simple and probably genuine (cf. S46, 1184).

However, there is reason to believe that the text has been interpolated. The clause which begins by referring to the intention of founding a monastery and the sanction are both closely paralleled in another Selsey charter of some 80 years later, Offa's grant to bishop Oswald:-

S45: 'ad construendum in ea monasterium basilicamque erigendam .
que diuinis laudibus et sanctorum honoribus . seruire uideatur .
id est xxxiii . cassatos in locis qui appellatur hoc est in
Lydeseye ...';

S108: 'ad construendum in ea monasterium . basilicamque augendam .
que diuinis laudibus . et sanctorum honoribus seruire uideatur .
imperpetuam attribuo possessionem . id est . viii cassatos in
loco qui appellatur . Bixlea'.
id est . viii cassatos in loco qui appellatur . Bixlea'.

S45: 'Si quis hanc donacionem attributam tibi . in maximo aliquo
uel in modico minuere ausus sit : sciat se in districto
omnipotentis dei iudicio penam presumpcionis sue incurrere';

S108: 'Si quis hand donacionem a me attributam in maximo uel in
modico aliquando imminuere ausus sit . sciat se in districto

omnipotentis dei iudicio penam presumptionis sue incurrere .
et ob auditu malo liberari'.

The resemblances here, first noticed by Barker (1947, p. 94 n. 1), are so close as to render it extremely likely that these clauses have been copied from one of these charters into the other. There are no parallels for these wordings elsewhere, either in seventh-century charters or in charters of Offa's time, so it is difficult to demonstrate conclusively in which of the two charters the clauses are more likely to have originated, but it seems improbable that they could be authentic parts of Nothhelm's charter. They do not read like seventh-century work. The earliest charters were commonly brief and simple, relying heavily on standard, often ancient, formulas, and the formula invariably used in the earliest foundation charters was simply 'ad construendum monasterium'. The sanctions of seventh-century charters normally consist of variations on a few basic formulas, none of which appears in the wording quoted above. Moreover, there is a distinct non-sequitur in the text of Nothhelm's charter, and this occurs in the first passage quoted above, immediately after the word 'appellatur', that is at the point where the duplication of wording ends. This suggests that a clause has been interpolated and that the compiler has failed to make the necessary adjustment to the original wording. It is noticeable that if the whole of the duplicated passage from 'ad construendum' to 'appellatur' is omitted, the text reads quite logically and grammatically, subject only to the insertion at some point of the word cassatos. On the whole, the probability seems to be that the duplicated clauses are spurious in Nothhelm's charter, and have been added at some time to an authentic but very brief (possibly abbreviated) charter, with a view to producing a more substantial and impressive document. We have no means of knowing whether Nothhelm's charter originally included a sanction or any reference to the foundation of a monastery.

The dating clauses in the two charters also closely correspond, and this may be part of the borrowed material in Nothhelm's charter, but the wording is too common for this to be certain. (The same may be said of several other very common phrases occurring in both texts). The dating clause can scarcely be genuine as it stands, since it dates Nothhelm's grant only by an incarnational year. It may be that this date, 692, has been added to an originally undated charter, or it may have been substituted for an indiction. The latter seems more likely, since the date suits the witness list (see below), and a writer of later date would have had difficulty in dating this charter so accurately.

The impression given by the wording is, therefore, that Nothhelm's charter is basically authentic, but that it has been interpolated at a later date; and it may be that some details, such as an indiction and perhaps other dating information, have been dropped.

Other considerations suggest that the surviving document is based on a genuine seventh-century charter. The king's full name, Nothhelm, is recorded only in the dispositio of this charter. In the witness list he is called 'Nunna (MS Numa) Rex Sussaxonum', and it is as Nunna that he appears elsewhere: in another charter which may be basically authentic (S42) and in the Chronicle (ASC s.a. 710). Forgers making use of his name called him Nunna (S43, 44). The full name is probably an authentic detail preserved in this charter. Moreover, the use of the full name in the dispositio and of the hypocoristic form in the witness list suggests that these sections of the document were drawn up quite independently, which is consistent with what we know of early charter-writing. The beneficiary of the charter, Nothhelm's sister Nothgyth, is otherwise unknown and not likely to have been invented.

The witness list has every appearance of authenticity. Following Nunna's attestation is that of 'Wattus Rex', presumably a South Saxon ruler subordinate to Nothhelm. These two kings also attest Bruny's

charter (S1173), but the possibility exists that their names have been borrowed from this document. (Another witness list, appended to the spurious charter S43, consists entirely of names which occur in Nothhelm's charter and have almost certainly been borrowed from it. This cannot be regarded as evidence for any of the persons concerned.) The next two witnesses are 'Coenredus Rex Westsaxonum' and Ine who is given no title. The former is presumably Ine's father, and this is the only occasion on which he appears as king. There is no parallel for the use of the title rex West Saxonum so early, the usual style of a West Saxon king at this time being rex Saxonum, but the more specific title was doubtless used here because it was necessary to distinguish the West Saxon from the South Saxon king. The spelling of Coenred's name is consistent with an early exemplar.

Three churchmen follow, 'Eaedd' episcopus', who is probably Eadberht, first holder of the see of Selsey; abbot Aldhelm of Malmesbury; and abbot Hagona, who is known from several other attestations (S235, 245, etc.). The titles of the first two are inconsistent according to the information of Bede, who dates the consecration of Aldhelm as bishop of Sherborne before that of Eadberht, abbot of Selsey, as bishop of that church when it became an episcopal see (HE V 18). It seems likely that Eadberht actually attested as abbot, and that a copyist, to whom he was well-known as founder of the see, altered the title either through absent-mindedness or under the impression that he was correcting an error in his exemplar. Other names have probably been omitted by the cartularist, but the abbreviated list which survives has every appearance of authenticity.

The list may be dated to the period between the abdication of Ceadwalla and the consecration of Aldhelm, 688 x 705. The date stated in the text, 692, cannot be verified, but is quite likely to be correct. Nothhelm is recorded as king in 710 and 714 (ASC s.a. 710; S42 - again

the date of this charter cannot be verified), and a reign of 22 years is not at all implausible. Coenred's other datable appearances are as a minor West Saxon ruler in the period 669 x 675 (S1164), and as one of those involved in the production of Ine's laws which can be dated to 688 x 694.

The land given to Nothgyth is said to total 33 hides, detailed as follows:-

12 hides at Lydeseye and Aldyngborne;

10 hides at Lenstedegate;

11 hides at Mondehame;

2 hides on the east bank;

3 hides on the west bank.

Most editors have amended the total figure of hides to 38 to fit the total of the separate areas listed (K995, B78, EHD, no. 59), but another method of reconciling the figures has been suggested, and this seems preferable: the total figure of 33 hides is correct and refers only to the first three areas listed; the last two are explanatory clauses relating to Mondehame, probably incorporating the miscopying of u as ii and ui as iii (Barker 1947, p. 71 n. 5). This interpretation makes better sense of the last two items in the list which would otherwise be entirely obscure. It should be mentioned that the place-names in this charter are spelt wrongly in all the modern editions (K995, B78, Barker 1947, no. IV), and Lenstedegate (as Genstedegate) also in Whitelock's translation (EHD, no. 59) and Sawyer's handlist (S45). The reason for this seems to be that Kemble adjusted the spelling to bring it into line with that in another charter in which the same places are mentioned (S232), and other editions are based on his. Dugdale (1817, Vol. VI, p. 1165, no. 3) presents substantially accurate versions of the names.

The first two places are now Lidsey and Aldingbourne; the third is tentatively identified with Westergate in Aldingbourne; and the

last is Mundham. These are all in Sussex, within 3-4 miles of each other and less than 10 miles from Selsey. Aldingbourne and Mundham were among the estates which were the subject of a dispute between the bishop of Selsey and the layman Ælfsige in the mid tenth century (S1291), and all four of the place-names in Nothhelm's charter are included in the list of estates claimed for Selsey in the Chichester charter which was fabricated in connection with the tenth-century dispute (S232). The question arises whether the substance of Nothhelm's charter has been altered in the tenth century to support Selsey's claims.

It is argued above that the surviving text is interpolated. The document has also been altered by the addition of a spurious endorsement in which Nothgyth is represented as handing over all the lands she has received to bishop Wilfrid (S1172). This was evidently intended to provide an explicit assertion of Selsey's title to the estates, and it was probably done at the time of the dispute, when fabrications in the form of grants to Wilfrid were produced (S230, 232). But it is also possible that the endorsement was forged at some other time: Wilfrid was the founder of Selsey, and his name could have been used on more than one occasion.

It is possible that the estates named in Nothhelm's charter were originally different, and that those in the surviving text were introduced into the document in the tenth century in connection with the dispute, but certain considerations suggest that in fact this is unlikely. Firstly, it is difficult to see what purpose would have been served by an additional title deed for just a few of the properties concerned. Secondly, the hidages in Nothhelm's charter do not agree with those in the spurious charter of Ceadwalla, as they would probably have done if the details of the estates in the two documents had been drawn up at the same time and for the same purpose, although it is to be noted that the hidages in S232 have been adjusted to produce the figure of 87 hides which Eddius

mentions as granted to Wilfrid (Brooks 1984, p. 240). Thirdly, the place-names Lidsey and Westergate do not appear in either the authentic dispute charter (S1291) or in Domesday Book, which tends to suggest that by the tenth century these areas were included within the estate of Aldingbourne, which in 1066 was assessed at 36 hides (DB Sussex, p. 3.3). If this assumption is correct, it follows that these names could not have been introduced into Nothhelm's charter by a tenth-century writer, who would not have known them as separate entities, but must have been borrowed by the author of S232 from some earlier record, presumably Nothhelm's charter. It is not implausible that estates named in an authentic early charter of the Selsey archive should appear in the records of a dispute which seems to have involved a large proportion of Selsey's properties, and other apparently authentic charters (S42, 46, 403) relate to estates which were involved in the dispute and/or are named in the fabricated charters.

When every aspect of this document has been considered, it appears overwhelmingly likely that the surviving text is based on an authentic charter recording a grant by king Nothhelm to his sister, and attested by the witnesses whose names are preserved - and probably also by many more. It is clear that the charter has been interpolated, but the extent of the interpolation is not certain. It seems likely that the substance of the document has not been altered: that much of the wording is preserved, the transaction is genuine, and the added passages serve only to pad out the text and to state Selsey's claim to the property. These alterations may or may not have been made in connection with use of this charter to support Selsey's claims in the tenth-century dispute. But there does remain a possibility that there has been more thorough falsification of the record, and that the property granted to Nothgyth was not that recorded in the surviving version of the charter.

Whether the meeting recorded in this document took place in Sussex

or Wessex or on the border is not clear, but the transaction is entirely an internal South Saxon affair, and indeed a family matter. The presence of the West Saxon kings cannot strictly be said to confirm, but is at least consistent with, Bede's assertion that Ceadwalla ruled Sussex with a rod of iron and that Ine then continued to do so for many years (HE IV 15). Nothhelm ('Nunna') fought against the Cornish as Ine's ally in 710 (ASC s.a.; the northern recension's guess that Nunna was Ine's kinsman may be disregarded; such guesswork is commonly introduced to account for obscure persons), which may indicate that Ine still had power over the South Saxons at that time.

When Ceadwalla first conquered Sussex he killed the king, Æthilwalh. Nothhelm apparently became king of the South Saxons during the period of West Saxon dominance, and presumably secured this position by virtue of his willingness to co-operate with the West Saxons. It seems likely that his N-alliterating family fell from power when West Saxon rule in Sussex ended. The kings and duces who succeeded nearly all had vowel-alliterating names (S46, 48, 1184, etc.), and it may be that they belonged to the old South Saxon royal dynasty which Ceadwalla had defeated in the person of Æthilwalh.

* * * * *

According to this document, Coenred was king of the West Saxons. Whitelock doubted that the title was a correct and valid part of the text (EHD, no. 59), but it would be a very odd error. Admittedly, at least one title in this witness list is almost certainly wrong, and admittedly copyists very frequently introduce errors, but even a medieval scribe did not normally transfer a royal title from a famous king to his obscure supporter. Moreover, it is a fact, and a fact probably unknown to later copyists of this charter, that in some respects Coenred

was the senior man: not only was he the older man, he was Ine's father; and their relative positions in this document suggest a much more normal situation for a father and son than that indicated by the prologue to Ine's laws. These considerations suggest that the title should probably be accepted as genuine.

Coenred then, according to this charter, was king of the West Saxons and Ine was his supporter. But the incontrovertible evidence of the laws is that Ine was king of the West Saxons and Coenred his supporter (Attenborough, Laws, p. 36). The two sources might be reconciled by assuming that the charter is correctly dated 692; that Coenred succeeded Ceadwalla as king, ruled for 4-5 years and then abdicated in favour of Ine; and that the laws postdate the charter and the abdication (which they could do, the latest possible date for the laws being 694). But this theory is not consistent with the fact that Coenred was not included in the West Saxon king-list. According to surviving king-lists, Ine succeeded Ceadwalla (EHD, no. 1, p. 147); also the unpublished list in B.L., Cotton Tiberius B v, fo. 22r); and the same statement is made in the Chronicle, which is probably based chiefly on king-lists (ASC s.a. 688) and by Bede, who knew nothing of Ine except his accession, abdication and retirement to Rome, and whose information appears to derive ultimately from king-lists (HE V 7). The evidence of the South Saxon charter therefore appears to contradict that of the West Saxon sources.

It is possible, however, to suggest a theory which would reconcile this apparent contradiction. In the South Saxon charter both Coenred and Ine are placed in the witness list with royal personages and before bishops. It may be deduced that Coenred and Ine were the rulers of Wessex. In the prologue to the laws, Ine refers to the advice of his father: both men were active in the production of the law code. In a spurious Abingdon charter (S241) whose author clearly had access to

some genuine early records, Coenred and Ine are mentioned as monastic benefactors, and their grant was made jointly: 'Ini et Conred simul dederunt'. All three pieces of evidence say the same thing: Coenred and Ine acted in partnership; there were in effect two kings of Wessex. If we may trust the date of the South Saxon charter, and guess that the law code dates from not later than the same year, this situation continued until 692. Down to that date Ine appears only with Coenred. From 693 onwards he acted alone (S238, 240, etc.).

This theory does not contradict the evidence of the king-lists. The king-lists only recognise one king - but king-lists only ever recognise one king at a time, irrespective of the true situation, and it is now generally appreciated just what complicated arrangements, what multiple kingships, usurpations, foreign interventions and other alarums and excursions this very simple form of record conceals. The fact that the king-lists say there was only one king in Wessex is no obstacle at all to the belief that there were in effect two.

Of the two it was Ine who was represented as king of the West Saxons in official West Saxon sources, the king-list and the laws. Since father and son were on friendly terms and working together, this can only have been the voluntary decision of Coenred. There is no direct evidence to show why this was done, but a hypothesis which accounts for it can be tentatively suggested. Coenred was active as a minor ruler in Wessex in the early 670s (S1164), and is not recorded as active later than the early 690s. He was clearly not a young man in 688 when his family acquired supreme power in Wessex, and in Anglo-Saxon terms he may have been an old one (Manchester 1983, pp. 8-9). Possibly his state of health was not good. He may have had reason to believe that his reign would not be a long one, and this may be the key to the decision he appears to have taken.

A king naturally wishes his son to succeed him, and it is clear

that strenuous efforts were made by Anglo-Saxon kings to achieve this result. Offa of Mercia, for example, had his son consecrated as king in his own lifetime, and it may have been partly for this reason that Ecgberht of Wessex appointed his son as king of the conquered province of Kent. It seems possible that Coenred, a mature man with a grown up son, adopted the expedient of making his son king in the first place. During his own lifetime this probably made little difference, he and Ine working together and ruling jointly, but on his death it meant that Ine simply continued as king. There was no official end of a reign; no struggle to seize the vacant kingship; no faction-fight which the king's son might or might not win. Coenred, in short, appears to have transferred his property into the name of his son in order to avoid death duties, and this plan, if plan it were, seems to have worked.

It is not very surprising that the South Saxon author of Nothhelm's charter should have been unacquainted with this arrangement, since, according to the hypothesis advanced above, it was really a formality relating to West Saxon internal affairs. Coenred and Ine were the West Saxon rulers, and the South Saxon writer not unnaturally gave the precedence and the formal title to the older man.

5. PETERBOROUGHPage(a) Introduction

470

(b) The Charter

470

(a) Introduction

The monastery at Medeshamstede, later Peterborough, was one of the few Anglo-Saxon monasteries which possessed incontrovertible evidence of their foundation in the seventh century, the establishment of the house by Seaxwulf, later bishop of the Mercians, being mentioned by Bede (HE IV 6). Moreover, the archive of the house retained copies of a number of documents, apparently genuine, dating from the early years of its history (S1803-6), although the community also fabricated documents purporting to relate to the early period (e.g. S68).

The early charters of Peterborough survive principally in two cartularies of which the earlier, dating from the twelfth century, is now the Society of Antiquaries' manuscript 60 (Davis 1958, no. 754); the later manuscript dates from the mid-thirteenth century and is the property of the Peterborough Dean and Chapter, their manuscript I, known as the Register of Robert of Swaffham (Davis 1958, no. 757). This manuscript is now deposited in the University Library at Cambridge, but a photocopy is retained at Peterborough. Some charters are also transcribed in a third cartulary, Peterborough Dean and Chapter's manuscript 5, the Book of Charters of Henry Pytchley the Younger, dating from the mid-thirteenth century (Davis 1958, no. 756), now deposited at Cambridge.

All of the Peterborough charters relating to the early period were discussed by Stenton in his article on 'Medeshamstede and its colonies' (Stenton 1933), which is still extremely useful and to which the following discussion is indebted.

(b) The Charter

S233

London, Society of Antiquaries' manuscript 60, fos. 36r-37v.

(Edition: B89)

The only Peterborough charter of relevance to early Wessex survives

in transcriptions in the three cartularies mentioned above. Birch's edition is substantially accurate, and his paragraphs reflect the divisions in the earliest manuscript. Whitelock rightly remarks that the sentences in brackets placed at the heads of two of the witness lists are additions of no validity, not appearing in any manuscript (quoted in S233), but Birch is correct in presenting five distinct lists. The word 'Medeshamstede' in abbot Headda's subscription is, as the editor indicates, a later addition in a different hand, and should not be regarded as a valid part of the text.

The charter is a curious, composite document which begins as a grant of Ceadwalla to an abbot called Ecgbald of land at Hoo in Kent, and then goes on to describe the confirmation of this grant by four other kings, Sighere of Essex, Swæfheard of Kent, Wihtried of Kent and Æthilred of Mercia, the confirmation of Swæfheard extending to include a further grant of an area of land adjacent to that granted by Ceadwalla. Statements relating to the political history of the period link these grants and confirmations to form a continuous narrative. Appended to the charter are a number of witness lists including the names of all these kings.

It is fairly clear that of this document only the subscriptions and perhaps a few phrases in the text can possibly represent authentic, seventh-century work. The narrative passages have no parallel in authentic, early charters, and those parts of the text which basically follow a conventional pattern, such as the first section recording the grant of Ceadwalla, which contains an invocation, proem, dispositio and sanction, are worded in a style bearing no resemblance to that of genuine, early charters, and totally lacking the standard formulas used by early writers. It is possible that the substance of an authentic charter or charters is embodied in the extant text, but if so there has been very thorough re-writing at a much later date.

In spite of the very dubious nature of the text, it is virtually certain that this document is ultimately based on authentic seventh-century material, since the witness lists could not possibly have been invented by a forger. The lists of names are set out below, with the individuals identified where possible and, in the case of comparatively obscure persons, some reference to other evidence.

1. CEADWALLA, king of the West Saxons (c. 686-688)

Theodore, archbishop of Canterbury (669-690)

Eorcenwald, bishop of London

Berhtwald, abbot of Reculver (-693) (HE V 8; S8); later
archbishop of Canterbury

Hagona, West Saxon abbot (S45, 235, 245, 1171).

2. SIGHERE, king of the East Saxons (HE III 30)

Eadberht, West Saxon layman (S235)

Gebred, Kentish layman (S8, 10, 18)

Egera (unknown)

Snocca, West Saxon layman (S235)

Teoda, West Saxon layman (S235)

Cuffa (unknown).

3. SWÆFHEARD, East Saxon king ruling Kent (HE V 8; S 10, 11)

Sebbi, king of the East Saxons

Hadrian, abbot of St. Peter and St. Paul's, Canterbury

Huduc (unknown)

Ealhweard (unknown)

Sighere (unknown)

Hæccī (unknown).

4. WIHTRED, king of Kent

Gebmund, bishop of Rochester

Berhtwald, abbot of Reculver

Beonrheard, Kentish layman (S8, 10)

Hæccī (unknown, but see list 3)

Isheard (unknown)

Ealhweard (unknown, but see list 3).

5. ÆTHILRED, king of the Mercians (675-704)

Seaxwulf, bishop of Lichfield

Eadwald, Mercian layman (S75-7)

Wealdhere, Mercian layman (S75)

Hælrīc (unknown)

Cille, Mercian layman (S76-7)

Teoda (unknown unless the West Saxon layman of list 2)

Etenca (unknown)

Headda, abbot (? of Bredon; S1803-5)

Helmwulf (unknown).

No name in any of these lists can be shown to be anachronistic, and the majority of these men can be shown to have been active at much the same time. Several of them are very obscure and are otherwise recorded only in charters which survive in other archives, to which no-one at Peterborough is likely to have had access. There can be no serious doubt that these witness lists are substantially genuine and date from the late 680s or early 690s.

It is therefore worthwhile to consider to what extent the substance of one or more authentic charters may survive in the extant text. The first transaction recorded is Ceadwalla's grant to abbot Ecgbald of 40 hides of land 'ubi Hogh nuncupatur ad Hebureahg insulam pertingentes'. The abbot appears as a witness in an early East Saxon charter (S1171).

The estate is identified as Hoo in Kent. This grant is quite plausible: Ceadwalla ravaged Kent in 686 and 687 (ASC s.a.), and may well have exercised power there long enough to make grants of the land he had annexed, as he did in Surrey (S235, 1248). Moreover, a transaction involving a West Saxon king, an East Saxon abbot and a Kentish estate would account for the presence in the first two witness lists of men from Wessex, Essex and Kent. Since both lists contain this mixture, it seems likely, as Whitelock suggested (quoted in S233), that the cartularist was mistaken in separating these two lists, that they are in fact a single list, and that king Sighere attested Ceadwalla's charter. This assumption involves the rejection of the next statement in the text, which is that Sighere added his confirmation at a later date. This statement itself may derive from the mistaken division of the witness list.

King Swæfheard, an East Saxon and son of Sebbi, who exercised power in at least part of Kent, is said to confirm the earlier grant and also to have extended it by granting 20 hides of land adjacent to the estate at Hoo and also 6 hides in another place called 'Fercanhamstede', of value for its woodlands. It is quite usual to find that the confirmation of a later king has been appended to a charter, and this often takes the form of attestations, sometimes a complete witness list (e.g. S65). Moreover, such confirmations were particularly necessary in areas where political power had changed and owners of estates doubted whether the grants of earlier rulers would be recognised by the new kings. This appears to have been the situation in Kent: West Saxon power in the south-east seems to have been short-lived, and other 'reges dubii vel externi' took over, including the East Saxon Swæfheard. Abbot Ecgbald may well have taken the precaution of securing his endorsement of Ceadwalla's charter.

On the other hand, it is not usual to find that such later confirmations

incorporate additional grants: one would expect such a grant to be made in a separate charter. This consideration suggests the possibility that the compiler of the surviving document had before him a separate charter recording Swæfheard's grant and containing the witness list headed by this king, and that he combined this with Ceadwalla's charter, producing a composite record (as was suggested by Stenton 1933, p. 190).

The text then goes on to narrate the successive confirmations of Wihtred of Kent and Æthilred of Mercia. These are quite plausible in themselves. Bede records that the Kentish royal family was restored to power in the person of Wihtred (HE IV 26), and charters provide confirmatory evidence of Wihtred's rule (S15, 19, 20, etc.). His confirmatory witness list may have been appended to Ceadwalla's charter, or Swæfheard's charter, or a charter of Ceadwalla confirmed by Swæfheard. Æthilred too is recorded as having authority in Kent (S10, 12), and could also have endorsed abbot Ecgbald's title-deed, although one would rather expect that his endorsement preceded that of Wihtred as his period of power in Kent appears to have done.

There is an authentic early charter which has two confirmatory witness lists appended to it (S65), and there seems to be no particular reason why another charter should not have had three or four such lists added, while the rapid changes in political power in Kent in the 680s and 690s do render such successive confirmations quite plausible. There is no parallel for such an accumulation of witness lists in one charter, but it cannot be said to be impossible. There are, however, other possibilities. It has already been suggested that there may have been a second charter in the name of Swæfheard. It may be that the witness lists headed by Wihtred and Æthilred actually derive from separate charters issued in the names of these kings. If the compiler of this document had before him charters of these kings granting lands not then owned by Peterborough, or perhaps no longer identifiable, he could have decided to discard

these documents and use their witness lists to add authority to the title-deed for Hoo. Moreover, it is possible that no genuine charter used by the compiler referred to Hoo, and that he converted one or more charters relating to other estates into a title-deed for this land. In the absence of the original wording, there can be no certainty about the authenticity of the content of this charter.

The monastery ruled by abbot Ecgbald is not named in the text. It might have been Medeshamstede, but this is merely one possibility, and certain considerations tend to operate against it. Ecgbald is otherwise recorded only in an East Saxon context, and the initial transaction recorded here involves West Saxons, East Saxons and people based in Kent, but not Mercians. This tends to suggest that Ecgbald's monastery was in Essex, the donor and the estate accounting for West Saxon and Kentish involvement. Moreover, it seems unlikely that Ceadwalla would have made a grant of land to a Mercian monastery. And there are plenty of instances of charters surviving in the archives of monasteries other than those to which they originally related. The charter or charters on which this document is based may have been handed over to Medeshamstede with the land.

The history of the estate at Hoo is obscure. A charter in the name of Wihtried of Kent (S22) lists Hoo among Kentish monasteries, and Stenton accepted this as evidence for a seventh-century monastery at Hoo (Stenton 1933, p. 190 n. 2). However, Brooks has shown that the charter in question is a ninth-century forgery (Brooks 1984, pp. 191-7), so it cannot be regarded as supplying any evidence for the seventh century. What it does tell us is that there was a monastery at Hoo in the ninth century. This circumstance, considered in conjunction with the fact that Peterborough had a number of 'cells' or 'colonies' forming a family of monasteries (discussed in Stenton 1933), and the fact that the charter recording Ceadwalla's grant of Hoo survives in the Peterborough archive,

strongly suggests that the monastery at Hoo was a cell of Peterborough, as Stenton thought (1933, p. 190 n. 2). Admittedly this conclusion is not supported by any incontrovertible evidence linking Hoo with Peterborough: the charter which lists Hoo among Peterborough's estates (S68) is a fabrication, and its author appears to have borrowed the name of Hoo from Ceadwalla's charter; similarly the twelfth-century Peterborough historian, Hugh Candidus, who included Ecgbald in a list of abbots of Peterborough, probably took the name from this charter (Stenton 1933, p. 190); in 1066 the manor of Hoo was held by Earl Godwin (DB Kent, p. 5.93). However, the circumstantial evidence seems significant, and it may be tentatively suggested that the early history of Hoo was as follows: the estate came into the possession of the church in consequence of Ceadwalla's grant to Ecgbald, and was initially part of the endowment of Ecgbald's monastery, which was probably in Essex. Later it was transferred, with the relevant documentation, into the possession of Medeshamstede, and a monastery was founded there, this being one of the group of monasteries attached to Medeshamstede. The monastery at Hoo was established not later than the early ninth century and disappeared before the Conquest. There are other possibilities, for example that a monastery was founded at Hoo as a cell of Ecgbald's house before the estate was transferred to Medeshamstede, or that Ecgbald's house was itself a cell of Medeshamstede, so that there was a connection between Hoo and Medeshamstede from the time of Ceadwalla's grant. The evidence does not enable the history of the estate and the monastery to be reconstructed with any certainty.

It has been suggested that Ecgbald was himself abbot of Hoo (EHD, no. 60, p. 487 n. 9), and hence that Ceadwalla's charter was a foundation charter (Brooks 1984, p. 183). Nothing in the surviving text supports this theory, and the fact that the grant was made to an abbot is a strong argument against it, since there was not usually an abbot on the scene

when land was granted 'ad construendum monasterium'. Even when land was granted to an individual who fully intended to become head of the new monastery, that individual did not claim abbatial status at the time of the grant (e.g. S89, 252). The one exception is the Hwiccian grant to abbess Cuthswith (S53), but in this case it is possible that she was proposing to found a daughter-house of an existing monastery (cf. S1803; also S255). It remains highly unlikely that Ceadwalla's charter was originally a foundation charter.

The Peterborough charter serves to confirm the reality of Ceadwalla's power in the south-east, but suggests, in conjunction with other evidence, that West Saxon power in the area was very short-lived.

6. WESTMINSTER

	<u>Page</u>
(a) <u>Introduction</u>	480
(b) <u>The Charter</u>	480

(a) Introduction

The monastery at Westminster may have been founded at an early date, but there is no reliable evidence of this. It certainly existed in the tenth century, but was not a notably wealthy or prestigious house until its virtual refoundation by Edward the Confessor (Harmer, Writs, pp. 286-7). The archive of the house includes 20 charters and writs on single sheets. Modern scholars judge that most if not all of these are copies of later date, not originals, and in many cases the texts have been interpolated or are wholly spurious. Only two documents (S124, 1248) purport to date from a period earlier than the tenth century: evidently the Westminster community made no serious attempt to claim great antiquity for their establishment.

(b) The CharterS1248

O.S. Facs, Vol. II, Westminster, No. 1.

(Edition: B82)

The single charter in the Westminster archive which has some relevance to early Wessex survives only on a single sheet, Westminster Abbey Muniments, No. 1, written in the eleventh century. Birch's edition is better than the more recent one by Hart (ECEE, pp. 135-6) since the latter is incomplete and includes some errors. However, the text has been substantially elucidated by Hart (ECEE, pp. 136-41), and his thorough discussion renders a detailed account of the charter here superfluous, so only a brief summary is provided, incorporating one or two points which are offered as additions to Hart's discussion.

The extant text presents a number of problems: the identities of the donor and beneficiary are obscured by deletions in the manuscript; there are internal inconsistencies, not all of the witnesses being active

at the same date; and there is clear evidence of some interpolation, since the charter is dated 693 but includes an Old English boundary clause which is certainly of much later date. Hart establishes by convincing arguments that the document is substantially genuine; that the donor was Eorcenwald, bishop of London, and the beneficiary the double monastery at Barking; and that the witness list is a fusion of two lists, one basically West Saxon and dating from the reign of Ceadwalla, who attests, and the other basically Mercian and dating from 693.

One witness whom Hart failed to identify, 'Eadgar electus', was probably bishop-elect of Lindsey (HE IV 12). The arrangement of the subscriptions on the manuscript, obscured in both Birch's and Hart's editions, is consistent with the theory that there are actually two separate lists. The names are arranged thus:-

Eorcenwald, bishop	
Wilfrid, bishop	
Hæddi, bishop	
Æthilred, king	
Hagona, abbot	Ceadwalla, king
Hooc, priest	Wynberht, abbot
Eadberht	Cisi
Headda, bishop	Berhtwald, archbishop
Tyrctil, bishop	Brihtmær, bishop
Eadgar, bishop-elect	Wealdhere, bishop
Wecca	Eadmund, bishop-elect
Tidbald, abbot	Cotta, abbot

This list falls quite naturally into two halves, which are confused only by two things: firstly the displacement of king Æthilred, who is included in the wrong part of the list; and secondly the scribe's failure to indicate, by a space or any other method, the separation of the two parts. When these errors are rectified, two witness lists

appear, each internally consistent as far as this can be checked, and in accordance with Hart's theory:-

1.

Eorcenwald, bishop of London	
Wilfrid, bishop of York	
Hæddi, bishop of Winchester	
Hagona, abbot	Ceadwalla, king of Wessex
Hooc, priest	Wynberht, abbot of Nursling
Eadberht	Cisi
2.

Æthilred, king of Mercia	Berhtwald, archbishop of Canterbury
Headda, bishop of Lichfield	Brihtmær, bishop
Tyrctil, bishop of Hereford	Wealdhere, bishop of London
Eadgar, b-elect of Lindsey	Eadmund, bishop-elect
Wecca	Cotta, abbot
Tidbald, abbot	

The land granted by bishop Eorcenwald to Barking lay in Surrey and probably formed a single block of land, although three component areas are listed, 28 hides at Battersea, 20 at Washingham, a lost village just south of Battersea, and 20 on the west bank of the nearby river Wandle. The single set of bounds probably defines the whole area (PN Surrey, pp. 12-13). According to the text, the estate was given to Eorcenwald by king Ceadwalla and later confirmed by king Æthilred, and another charter which summarises grants to Barking lists the land as Ceadwalla's gift (S1246). The estate was acquired by Westminster shortly after the Conquest (DB Surrey, p. 6.1).

Hart suggests that Eorcenwald's charter was originally drawn up in the 680s with the West Saxon witness list, and that a revised version was produced when Æthilred confirmed the transaction in 693, the date being altered (or added), reference to Æthilred's confirmation introduced

and the second witness list appended. This seems to be correct. The document suggests that Ceadwalla exercised power in Surrey, but that after his death the area was brought back under Mercian control. The first point is confirmed by the Farnham charter (S235), and other charters confirm that Æthilred of Mercia was in power in south-east England in the period following Ceadwalla's death: his consent is mentioned in Kentish charters (S10, 12); he granted land in Middlesex to bishop Wealdhere of London (S1783); and another charter of the south-east, surviving in the Peterborough archive and relating to land in Kent, suggests that power was held successively by Ceadwalla of Wessex and Æthilred of Mercia (S233).

III. CONCLUSIONS

A. WEST SAXON DIPLOMATIC

Conclusions regarding the diplomatic of early West Saxon charters are based on those charters which there is reason to believe were drafted in scriptoria in Wessex, and which are judged to be substantially authentic, but it cannot be regarded as certain that every formula cited below is a genuine feature of the charter in which it appears. This account is modelled on a recent account of ninth-century diplomatic (Brooks 1984, pp. 327-30).

Invocation

In the period down to 745 there are 12 charters with no invocation in the extant transcripts, 12 instances of the 'In nomine ...' type of wording (S1164, 71/73, 1170, 234, 238, 243, 244, 245, 248, 1176), and only one occurrence of the ablative absolute type 'Regnante ...' (S1249). During the remainder of the period the ablative absolute occurs in 8 charters (S258, 265, 263, 269, 267, 270a, 1263, 283), the 'In nomine ...' type in 6 (S260, 261, 262, 268, 273, 277) and only 2 charters are without invocations (S1256, 264).

Proem

The most common proem, which occurs from the early 680s to the end of the eighth century and is in 7 of the 10 earliest extant West Saxon charters, contrasts the transitory nature of earthly things with the permanence of heavenly things, 'terrenis ac caducis eterna et mansura mercanda sunt' and variants (S71/73, 237, 1170, 1249, 231, 234, 255, 262, 263, 267). Several of these proems incorporate a biblical quotation asserting that we bring nothing into the world and take nothing out

of it, 'Nichil intulimus ...'

The remaining 3 of the earliest 10 charters and two others which date from the beginning of the eighth century include the 'literacy' proem, 'solus sermo sufficeret ...' (S1164, 236, 1169, 244, 248). Several charters from 693 onwards have no proem.

Royal Title

Down to 760 kings of the West Saxons are normally described simply as 'rex' (S236, 231, 234, 245, 248, 255, 259, 260) or as 'rex Saxonum' (S237, 238, 240, 243, 244, 265), the title often being accompanied by the phrase 'regnante domino'. These forms occasionally recur later, but after 760 the more usual style was 'rex Occidentalium Saxonum' (S261, 262, 270a - for 'regina'?, 283, 277). 'Rex Gewissorum' was used in a few instances from 745 onwards (S256, 262, 273).

Dispositive Words

The majority of charters are expressed in the past tense, but there are several instances of present tenses (S236, 1249, 238, 240, 245, 253, 259, 267, 270a) and two of future tenses (S262, 268). A wide variety of verbs is used and none can be specified as the 'normal' West Saxon formula, but 'largitus sum' occurs throughout the period (S71, 237, 256, 261, 269, 283, 273) and 'decreueram' or 'decreui' with an infinitive is common down to the beginning of the eighth century (S1164, 1169, 1170, 231, 234, 243; also S251). Expressions which combine two verbs are often used: 'donans impendo' (S238, 240); 'uideor contulisse' (S248); 'impendere curaui' (S255), etc.

Pertinence Clause

West Saxon charters of the seventh and eighth centuries do not commonly specify that the land is granted 'cum omnibus ad se pertinentibus',

but there is one isolated instance of this about the beginning of the eighth century (S252) and two clauses of this basic type occur in charters of Cyniwulf: 'necnon et uillam cui subiacent pascue . prata . arida . irrigua . simul et siluestria loca' (S260); 'cum omnibus quae ...' - manuscript damaged (S264). The clause begins to appear regularly only in the ninth century (S268, 283, 273, 277).

The Powers

The earliest extant West Saxon charter specifies the beneficiary's powers over the estate in an 'ut' clause incorporating a series of gerunds (S1164). Thereafter there is seldom any reference to powers for many years, only one other seventh-century example, 'et ad eum iure sect' (sic) pertinet' (S244) and three of the early eighth century which use a gerundive construction (S1179, 1253, 251). From 778 onwards the beneficiary's powers are usually stated, in most cases in the form of a series of gerunds, although other types of wording occur (S264, 269, 267, 268, 283, 273).

Estates and Boundaries

Two methods of specifying the land which is the subject of a charter are employed: the name of the estate may be given following a phrase such as 'in loco qui dicitur'; or the situation of the estate may be defined by reference to adjacent landmarks, commonly natural features such as water-courses, woods and hills. The latter method predominates in the seventh century, but thereafter both forms occur, the use of names for estates being the more common - but perhaps reflecting modernisation of the text in some instances. In some charters dealing with groups of estates, names are given to some lands while others are described by means of landmarks (S1249, 243, 248), which tends to suggest that the two methods do not represent different styles of charter writing,

but simply reflect the fact of whether the unit of land had a name or not.

Landmarks on two or more sides of the estate are sometimes specified, giving an appearance of rudimentary bounds; this occurs in charters of the seventh century (S1164, 237, 234, 238) and of the reign of Cyniwulf (S260, 261). In the same reign the earliest detailed perambulations appear, in Latin with Old English place-names (S262, 264). Boundary clauses of this type continued in use during the reign of Beorhtric (S267, 268) and probably throughout this period, although West Saxon evidence for Ecgberht's reign is lacking.

Immunities and Reservations

The first appearance in Wessex of immunity from secular obligations is in Ine's general grant to the churches of 704 (S245), but immunities relating to specific grants of land do not occur until the reign of Beorhtric (S267, 270a, 268). Different reservations are mentioned, and the clause does not seem to have become standardised in this period. There is only one instance of the inclusion of all three of the reservations which later became standard (S270a), and an example of Ecgberht's reign includes only two (S273).

Sanction

Prohibitive clauses occur in half of the surviving authentic charters of the period down to 710. Most are of general application, beginning 'ut nullus ...' (S1249, 231, 234, 238, 244, 1176), but three are more specific, the clause being directed against royal and lay power (S73) or the donor's successors (S240, 245). After 710 only two prohibitive clauses appear, both referring to the donor's successors (S259, 270a).

Penal clauses occur much more frequently throughout the period, and by far the most common wording asserts that a transgressor will

render account at the last judgement, 'sciat se ... rationem redditurum' (S71, 1169, 245, 262, etc.). Another type of penal clause which occurs throughout the period threatens separation from the church or the communion of saints (S1164, 1253, 251, 253, 1410, 256, 268, 277). A third formula, found only in seventh-century charters, says that a malefactor will incur the anger of God 'iram dei incurrat' (S1164, 236, 234) or the guilt of sacrilege (S237). A wording confined to mid eighth-century charters asserts that a transgressor will pay the penalty of his crime 'penas luat' (S253, 255, 1410, 256). Two other clauses say he will be cursed or excommunicated (S265, 277). It is not uncommon to find two or more formulas combined in one sanction (S1164, etc.).

Down to 710 only 4 charters contain blessings; all 4 refer to God increasing the benefactor's share in the book of life or simply in eternal life, 'augeat deus ...' (S71/73, 236, 237, 248). In later years blessings become more usual, but still occur in less than half of the extant authentic texts. Formulas similar to those in the earlier charters appear (S251, 255, 263, 273), and there are a few instances of different wordings (S253, 1410, 256, 265, 268).

Dating Clause

The dating clause is placed at the beginning of the text in only two charters, both of the seventh century (S1249, 238), and elsewhere occurs towards the end, usually preceding the witness list. The most common wording, which occurs throughout the period, is 'Scripta est ...' (S71, 231, 244, 248, 263, 283, etc.). 'Actum est ...' occurs in the seventh century (S1169, 243, 245), 'Acta est ...' in the early eighth century (S1253, 255), and 'Et hec acta sunt ...' thereafter (S259, 260, 264). A few other wordings occur in isolated instances.

Witness List

Nearly all witnesses' names are presented in one of two basic forms, 'Signum manus X', or a sentence beginning 'Ego ...' and ending with one or more verbs, often 'consensi et subscripsi'. Down to the early eighth century donors always attest in the form 'Signum manus' except in the case of the earliest extant charter where Coenred attests in the 'Ego ...' style (S1164). From 725 to 762 both wordings are used ('Ego' S251, 253, 256, 259, 265; 'Signum' S255, 260, 261). Thereafter only the 'Ego' form appears. Churchmen always attest in the 'Ego' form until c. 750. Thereafter both forms occur ('Ego' S262, 266, 270a, 268, 283, 277; 'Signum' S1256, 261, 269, 273; both S260, 263). Laymen subscribe as 'Signum manus X' throughout the period with only two exceptions (S1170 - Wudda; S270a).

The effect of these usages is to give witness lists of the period down to c. 750 an appearance of distinguishing those men who were literate and could write their own subscriptions, 'Ego ... subscripsi', these being chiefly clerics, from the illiterate, laymen and most kings, who could only make the sign of the cross. From c. 750 this distinction appears in some charters, is partly retained in others and is often wholly abandoned, and it appears that practice in this respect became more flexible.

It cannot be inferred from the distinction made in the early period that subscriptions or crosses were actually written by individual witnesses. The evidence of originals from south-east England suggests that in England attestations were always written out by one scribe. The distinction should probably be regarded merely as a convention, comparable with the frequent assertion that a witness subscribed 'manu propria' when in fact he did not.

Caveat

It should be emphasised that the surviving evidence is very limited and very fragmentary, and that certainty on the question of authenticity is in many cases impossible to achieve. Patterns appearing in the surviving evidence could be misleading, and generalisations are here largely avoided for that reason. The formulas of the charters are varied and there is no single diplomatic practice of which it could be said that it must appear in a text if the charter concerned is to be considered genuine. No distinct diplomatic traditions within Wessex are discernable. It cannot be said, for example, that there were (or were not) separate charter writing traditions based on diocesan scriptoria at Winchester and Sherborne; we simply do not have enough charters deriving from both dioceses at any one time to enable the comparison to be instituted.

B. ANALYSIS OF THE EARLY WEST SAXON CHARTERS

All the charters discussed in detail above are here divided into four categories according to the extent of their genuine content. Such a classification unavoidably over-simplifies the position, and should be considered only in conjunction with the arguments and judgements presented above. The categories used are:-

- I. Charters preserved as originals or contemporary copies.
- II. Charters preserved only in later copies of which the extant text appears to be entirely, or almost entirely, authentic, although in some instances abbreviated.
- III. Charters preserved only in later copies containing a mixture of authentic and spurious material:
 - (a) with a preponderance of authentic elements;
 - (b) with a preponderance of spurious elements.
- IV. Fabrications of no value as evidence for the period.

(For a similar but fuller classification, including the early charters of other Anglo-Saxon kingdoms, see Wormald 1984, pp. 24-6).

(A) WEST SAXON ARCHIVES

1. Glastonbury

- II. S1249, 248, 1253, DA p. 108, S152, 264.
- IIIa. S236, 237, 238, 246, 247, 251, 253, 1410, 270a.
- IIIb. S257.
- IV. S227, 250.

2. Malmesbury

- I. S96.

II. S1170, 231, 243, 245, 260, 149.

IIIa. S71, 73, 1169, 234, B106, S256.

IIIb. S1245.

IV. S1166, B114.

3. Winchester

II. S235, 259, 1263.

IIIa. S283, 273.

IIIb. S242, 254, 258, 275, 284, 272, 274, 276, 281.

IV. S229.

4. Abingdon

II. S1179, 269, 268.

IIIa. S252.

IIIb. S239, 241, 93, 166, 183, 278.

IV. S1603, 184.

5. Muchelney

II. S244, 1176, 261.

IIIa. S240.

IIIb. S249.

6. Bath

II. S1168, 1167, 265.

IIIa. S51.

7. Shaftesbury

II. S1164, 1256, 277.

8. Sherborne

II. S263.

IV. S228.

9. Exeter

IIIa. S255.

10. Wells

IIIa. S262.

11. Athelney

II. S267.

(B) OTHER ARCHIVES1. Christ Church, Canterbury

I. S1438.

II. S1258, 323.

IIIa. S108, 282, 286.

IIIb. S1610.

IV. S230, 270.

2. Rochester

IIIa. S280.

IIIb. S271.

3. St. Augustine's, Canterbury

II. S279.

4. Chichester

IIIa. S45.

IV. S232.

5. Peterborough

IIIb. S233.

6. Westminster

IIIa. S1248.

TOTALS

<u>Archive</u>	<u>I</u>	<u>II</u>	<u>IIIa</u>	<u>IIIb</u>	<u>IV</u>	<u>Total</u>
(A) <u>West Saxon</u>						
Glastonbury	-	6	9	1	2	18
Malmesbury	1	6	6	1	2	16
Winchester	-	3	2	9	1	15
Abingdon	-	3	1	6	2	12
Muchelney	-	3	1	1	-	5
Bath	-	3	1	-	-	4
Shaftesbury	-	3	-	-	-	3
Sherborne	-	1	-	-	1	2
Exeter	-	-	1	-	-	1
Wells	-	-	1	-	-	1
Athelney	-	1	-	-	-	1
(B) <u>Other</u>						
Christ Church	1	2	3	1	2	9
Rochester	-	-	1	1	-	2
St. Augustine's	-	1	-	-	-	1
Chichester	-	-	1	-	1	2
Peterborough	-	-	-	1	-	1
Westminster	-	-	1	-	-	1
	2	32	28	21	11	94
	62			32		94

The clearest conclusion to emerge from this study is that a large proportion of these charters are substantially genuine, far more than has usually been assumed, and that very few are wholly valueless, so that the charters furnish a quite considerable body of evidence for the early West Saxon kingdom.

INDEX OF CHARTERS

The references are to the main discussion of each charter which is considered in detail. Lost charters are not included.

<u>S</u>	<u>Archive</u>	<u>Page</u>
45	Chichester	457
51	Bath	346
71	Malmesbury	144
73	"	144
93	Abingdon	284
96	Malmesbury	201
108	Christ Church	419
149	Malmesbury	196
152	Glastonbury	85
166	Abingdon	296
183	"	303
184	"	300
227	Glastonbury	34
228	Sherborne	375
229	Winchester	211
230	Christ Church	418
231	Malmesbury	156
232	Chichester	457
233	Peterborough	470
234	Malmesbury	156
235	Winchester	213
236	Glastonbury	19
237	"	26
238	"	39
239	Abingdon	276
240	Muchelney	317
241	Abingdon	279
242	Winchester	220
243	Malmesbury	169
244	Muchelney	322
245	Malmesbury	173
246	Glastonbury	43
247	"	56
248	"	45
249	Muchelney	326
250	Glastonbury	61
251	Glastonbury	64
252	Abingdon	269
253	Glastonbury	67
254	Winchester	223
255	Exeter	399
256	Malmesbury	189
257	Glastonbury	75
258	Winchester	225
259	"	225

<u>S</u>	<u>Archive</u>	<u>Page</u>
260	Malmesbury	194
261	Muchelney	329
262	Wells	407
263	Sherborne	381
264	Glastonbury	97
265	Bath	353
267	Athelney	414
268	Abingdon	294
269	"	288
270	Christ Church	431
270a	Glastonbury	92
271	Rochester	440
272	Winchester	246
273	"	241
274	"	250
275	"	237
276	"	252
277	Shaftesbury	370
278	Abingdon	308
279	St. Augustine's	452
280	Rochester	445
281	Winchester	253
282	Christ Church	428
283	Winchester	238
284	"	238
286	Christ Church	435
323	Christ Church	433
1164	Shaftesbury	363
1166	Malmesbury	140
1167	Bath	339
1168	"	334
1169	Malmesbury	149
1170	"	152
1176	Muchelney	325
1179	Abingdon	273
1245	Malmesbury	136
1248	Westminster	480
1249	Glastonbury	31
1253	"	58
1256	Shaftesbury	363
1258	Christ Church	427
1263	Winchester	230
1410	Glastonbury	69
1438	Christ Church	437
1603	Abingdon	268
1610	Christ Church	419
1623	"	433

B

105/6	Malmesbury	161
114	"	186

DA

pp. 108, 110 Glastonbury 85

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND ABBREVIATIONS

- Anderson, Columba: Adomnan's Life of Columba, ed. A.O. and M.O. Anderson (1961).
- Arnold, Symeon of Durham: Symeon of Durham, Opera Omnia, ed. T. Arnold, Rolls Series, Vol. 75 (1882-5).
- ASC: Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, EHD no. 1.
- ASE: Anglo-Saxon England.
- Attenborough, Laws: The Laws of the Earliest English Kings ed. & trans. F.L. Attenborough (Cambridge, 1922).
- B: W. de G. Birch, Cartularium Saxonicum, 3 vols. (1885-99).
- Barker, E.E., 1947: 'Sussex Anglo-Saxon Charters', Sussex Archaeological Collections, Vol. 86, pp. 42-101.
- Barrie, M.A.F., 1968: 'The binding of the Sherborne Chartulary', The British Museum Quarterly, Vol. 32, pp. 96-8.
- Bates, Athelney Cart.: Two Cartularies of the Benedictine Abbeys of Muchelney and Athelney in the County of Somerset, ed. E.H. Bates, Somerset Record Society, Vol. 14 (1899).
- Bates, Muchelney Cart.: see Bates, Athelney Cart.
- Birch, W. de G., 1871: 'On the succession of the abbots of Malmesbury', Journal of the British Archaeological Association, Vol. 27, pp. 314-342.
- Birch, W. de G., 1892: The Anglo-Saxon Charter of Oslac, Duke of the South Saxons, AD 780.
- Blair, P.H., 1950: 'The Moore Memoranda on Northumbrian history', The Early Cultures of North-West Europe, ed. C. Fox and B. Dickins (Cambridge), pp. 245-257.
- Blunt, C.E., 1957: 'The coinage of Ecgbeorht, king of Wessex 802-839', British Numismatic Journal, Vol. 28, pp. 467-76.
- Blunt, C.E., 1961: 'The coinage of Offa', Anglo-Saxon Coins, ed. R.H. M. Dolley, pp. 39-62.
- Blunt et al., 1963: C.E. Blunt, C.S.S. Lyon and B.H.I.H. Stewart, 'The coinage of southern England 796-840', British Numismatic Journal, Vol. 32, pp. 1-74.
- B.M. Facs.: E.A. Bond, Facsimiles of Ancient Charters in the British Museum, 4 Vols. (1873-8).
- Brentnall, H.C., 1948: 'Bedwyn in the tenth century', Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine, Vol. 52, pp. 360-8.

- Brewer, Malmesbury Cart.: Registrum Malmesburiense, The Register of Malmesbury Abbey, Vol. 1, ed. J.S. Brewer; Vol. 2, ed. J.S. Brewer and C.T. Martin, Rolls Series, Vol. 72 (1879-80).
- Brooks, N.P., 1971: 'The development of military obligations in eighth- and ninth-century England', England Before the Conquest, ed. P. Clemoes and K. Hughes (Cambridge), pp. 69-84.
- Brooks, N.P., 1974: 'Anglo-Saxon Charters: the work of the last twenty years', ASE, Vol. 3., pp. 211-31.
- Brooks, N.P., 1984: The Early History of the Church of Canterbury (Leicester)
- Campbell, Æthelweard: The Chronicle of Æthelweard, ed. A. Campbell (1962).
- Campbell, Rochester Cart.: The Charters of Rochester, ed. A. Campbell, Anglo-Saxon Charters, Vol. 1 (1973).
- Campbell, J., 1971: 'The first century of Christianity in England', Ampleforth Journal, pp. 10-29.
- Campbell, J., 1973: 'Observations on the conversion of England', Ampleforth Journal, Vol. 78, pp. 12-26.
- Campbell, J., 1979: Bede's Reges and Principes, Jarrow Lecture.
- Campbell, J., 1982: The Anglo-Saxons.
- Carley, John of Glastonbury: John of Glastonbury, Chronica sive Antiquitates Glastoniensis Ecclesie, ed. J.P. Carley, British Archaeological Reports. Vol. 47 i (1978).
- Ch. L. A. : Chartae Latinae Antiquiores, ed. A. Bruckner and R. Marichal (1954-)
- Chadwick, H.M., 1905: Studies on Anglo-Saxon Institutions (Cambridge).
- Chaplais, P., 1965: 'The origin and authenticity of the royal Anglo-Saxon diploma', Journal of the Society of Archivists, Vol. 3, pp. 48-61.
- Chaplais, P., 1966a: 'The Anglo-Saxon chancery: from the diploma to the writ', Journal of the Society of Archivists, Vol. 3, pp. 160-76.
- Chaplais, P., 1966b: 'The authenticity of the royal Anglo-Saxon diplomas of Exeter', Chaplais 1981, pp. XV 1-34.
- Chaplais, P., 1968: 'Some early Anglo-Saxon diplomas on single sheets: originals or copies?', Journal of the Society of Archivists, Vol. 3, pp. 315-36.
- Chaplais, P., 1969: 'Who introduced charters into England? The case for Augustine', Journal of the Society of Archivists, Vol. 3, pp. 526-542.
- Chaplais, P., 1973: 'La chancellerie royal Anglaise des origines au règne de Jean sans Terre', International Congress of Diplomatic, Budapest.

- Chaplais, P., 1978: 'The letter of bishop Wealdhere of London to archbishop Brihtwold of Canterbury: the earliest original 'letter close' extant in the west', Chaplais 1981, pp. XIV 3-24.
- Chaplais, P., 1981: Essays in Medieval Diplomacy and Administration.
- Cod. L.A.: Codices Latini Antiquiores, ed. E.A. Lowe (Oxford, 1934-1971).
- Colgrave, Guthlac: Felix's Life of Guthlac . ed. and trans. B. Colgrave (Cambridge 1956).
- Colgrave, Wilfrid: The Life of Bishop Wilfrid by Eddius Stephanus, ed. and trans. B. Colgrave (Cambridge 1927).
- Continuatio Baedae, Plummer 1896, pp. 361-3.
- Cook, A.S., 1927: 'Who was the Ehfrid of Aldhelm's letter?', Speculum, Vol. 2, pp. 363-73.
- Cook, A.S., 1928: 'Aldhelm's rude infancy', Philological Quarterly, Vol. 7, pp. 115-9.
- Cook, A.S., 1929: 'A putative charter to Aldhelm', Studies in English Philology: A Miscellany in Honor of Frederick Klaeber, ed. K. Malone and M.B. Ruud (Minneapolis).
- Coxe, Roger of Wendover: Chronica sive Flores Historiarum, ed. H.O. Coxe, 4 vols. (1841).
- Courtois, Albertini Tablets: Tablettes Albertini, ed. C. Courtois, L. Leschi, C. Perrat and C. Saumagne (Paris 1952).
- Crawford, O.G.S., 1921: 'The Anglo-Saxon bounds of Bedwyn and Burbage', The Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine, Vol. 41, pp. 281-301.
- Crawford, O.G.S., 1922: The Andover District (Oxford).
- DA: William of Malmesbury, De Antiquitate Glastonie Ecclesie, ed. and trans. J. Scott, The Early History of Glastonbury (1981).
- Darlington, R.R., 1955: 'Anglo-Saxon Wiltshire', VCH, A History of Wiltshire, Vol. 2, pp. 1-34.
- Davidson, J.B., 1884: 'On the charters of king Ine', Proceedings of the Somersetshire Archaeological and Natural History Society, Vol. 30, Part 2, pp. 1-31.
- Davies, W., 1978: An Early Welsh Microcosm: Studies in the Llandaff Charters.
- Davies, W., 1979: The Llandaff Charters (Aberystwyth).
- Davies, W., 1982: 'The Latin charter tradition in western Britain, Brittany and Ireland in the early medieval period', Ireland in Early Medieval Europe, ed. D. Whitelock, R. McKitterick and D. Dumville (Cambridge).
- Davis, G.R.C., 1958: Medieval Cartularies of Great Britain: A Short Catalogue.

- DB Berkshire: Domesday Book Volume 5 Berkshire, ed. P. Morgan (Chichester 1979).
- DB Cornwall: Domesday Book Volume 10 Cornwall, ed. C. and F. Thorn, (Chichester 1979).
- DB Devon: VCH, A History of Devonshire, Vol. 1 (1906), translation of the Devonshire Domesday by O.J. Reichel, pp. 403-549.
- DB Dorset: Domesday Book Volume 7 Dorset, ed. C. and F. Thorn (Chichester 1983).
- DB Hampshire: Domesday Book Volume 4 Hampshire, ed. J. Munby (Chichester 1982).
- DB Kent: Domesday Book Vol. 1 Kent, ed. P. Morgan (Chichester 1983).
- DB Oxfordshire: Domesday Book Volume 14 Oxfordshire, ed. C. Caldwell (Chichester 1978).
- DB Somerset: Domesday Book Volume 8 Somerset, ed. C. and F. Thorn (Chichester 1980).
- DB Surrey: Domesday Book Volume 3 Surrey, ed. J. Morris (Chichester 1975).
- DB Sussex: Domesday Book Volume 2 Sussex, ed. J. Morris (Chichester 1976).
- DB Wiltshire: Domesday Book Volume 6 Wiltshire, ed. C. and F. Thorn (Chichester 1979).
- Dickinson, F.H., 1882: 'West Monkton charter', Proceedings of the Somersetshire Archaeological and Natural History Society, Vol. 8, Part 2, pp. 89-98.
- Dolley, R.H.M., and Skaare, K., 1961: 'The coinage of Æthelwulf, king of the West Saxons 839-858', Anglo-Saxon Coins, ed. R.H.M. Dolley, pp. 63-76.
- Dugdale, W., 1817: Monasticon Anglicanum, new edition by J. Caley, H. Ellis and B. Bandinel, Vol. 1.
- Dumville, D.N., 1976: 'The Anglian collection of royal genealogies and regnal lists', ASE, Vol. 5, pp. 23-50.
- Dumville, D.N., 1977: 'Kingship, genealogies and regnal lists', Early Medieval Kingship, ed. P.H. Sawyer and I.N. Wood (Leeds), pp. 72-104.
- ECDC: H.P.R. Finberg, The Early Charters of Devon and Cornwall, University College of Leicester, Department of English Local History, Occasional Papers, No. 2 (1953).
- ECEE: C.R. Hart, The Early Charters of Eastern England (Leicester 1966).
- ECTV: M. Gelling, The Early Charters of the Thames Valley (Leicester 1979).
- ECW: H.P.R. Finberg, The Early Charters of Wessex (Leicester 1964).
- ECWM: H.P.R. Finberg, The Early Charters of the West Midlands (Leicester 1961).

- EHD: English Historical Documents Vol. I. c. 500-1042, ed. D. Whitelock (second edition, 1979).
- Ehwald: Aldhelm, Opera Omnia, ed. R. Ehwald, MGH, Auctores Antiquissimi, XV (Berlin 1919).
- Ekwall, E., 1928: English River Names (Oxford).
- Ekwall, E., 1960: The Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Place-Names (Oxford).
- Evans, Llandaff Cart.: The text of the Book of Llan Dâv, ed. J.G. Evans and J. Rhys (Oxford 1893).
- Fägersten, A., 1933: The Place-Names of Dorset (Uppsala).
- Faricius: Faricius' Life of Aldhelm, Acta Sanctorum, Maii Tomus Sextus (1866), pp. 83-93.
- Finberg, H.P.R., 1951: 'Sherborne, Glastonbury and the expansion of Wessex', Lucerna (1964), pp. 95-115.
- Finberg, H.P.R., 1964: Lucerna.
- Finberg, H.P.R., 1969: West Country Historical Studies (Newton Abbot).
- Foerster, Liber Diurnus: Liber Diurnus Romanorum Pontificum, ed. H. Foerster (Berne 1958); cited with nos. from the Vatican MS,
- Gillingham, J.B., 1981: 'The introduction of knight service into England', Proceedings of the Battle Conference on Anglo-Norman Studies, Vol. IV, ed. R.A. Brown, pp. 53-64.
- GP: William of Malmesbury, De Gestis Pontificum Anglorum, ed. N.E.S.A. Hamilton, Rolls Series, Vol. 52 (1870).
- GR: William of Malmesbury, De Gestis Regum Anglorum, ed. W. Stubbs, Rolls Series, Vol. 90 (1887-9).
- Gray, L.H., 1935: 'The origin of the name of Glastonbury', Speculum, Vol. 10, pp. 46-53.
- Grundy, G.B., 1919: 'The Saxon land charters of Wiltshire', The Archaeological Journal, Vol. 76, pp. 143-301.
- Grundy, G.B., 1926: 'The Saxon land charters of Hampshire with notes on place and field names', Archaeological Journal, Vol. 33, pp. 91-253.
- Grundy, G.B., 1935: The Saxon Charters and Field Names of Somerset (Taunton).
- Grundy, G.B., 1938: 'The Saxon charters of Somerset: West Monkton, revised notes of its charter', Proceedings of the Somersetshire Archaeological and Natural History Society, Vol. 84, pp. 104-6.
- Haddan, A.W. and Stubbs, W.: Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents, Vol. 3 (Oxford 1871).
- Harrison, K., 1976: The Framework of Anglo-Saxon History to A.D. 900 (Cambridge).

- Hart, C.R., 1970: 'The Codex Wintoniensis and the King's Haligdom', Land, Church and People, The Agricultural History Review, Vol. 18, Supplement, ed. J. Thirsk, pp. 7-38.
- Hartmann, Gregory: Pope Gregory I, Registrum Epistolarum, Vol. 2, ed. L.M. Hartmann, MGH, Epistolae II, (Berlin 1899).
- HE: Bede, Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum, ed. B. Colgrave and R.A.B. Mynors, Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People (Oxford 1969).
- Hearne, John of Glastonbury: John of Glastonbury, Chronica sive Historia de Rebus Glastoniensibus, ed. T. Hearne (Oxford 1726).
- Henderson, C., 1925: The Cornish Church Guide (Truro).
- Henige, D.P., 1971: 'Oral tradition and chronology', Journal of African History, Vol. 12, pp. 371-89.
- Historia Abbatum, Plummer 1896, pp. 364-387.
- Historia Brittonum: Nennius, ed. J. Morris (1980).
- Historia Regum: Arnold, Symeon of Durham.
- Holdsworth, C., 1980: 'Boniface the monk', Reuter 1980, pp. 47-67.
- Holtzmann, W., 1930-52: Papsturkunden in England, 3 Vols (Berlin/Göttingen).
- Hunt, Bath Cherts.: Two Chartularies of the Priory of St. Peter at Bath, ed. W. Hunt, Somerset Record Society, Vol. 7 (1893).
- Jaffé, P., 1885: Regesta Pontificum Romanorum ad annum 1198.
- John, E., 1960: Land Tenure in Early England (Leicester).
- John, E., 1964: 'The church at Winchester and the tenth-century reformation', Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, Vol. 47, pp. 404-29.
- Jones, P.F., 1929: A Concordance to the Historia Ecclesiastica of Bede (Cambridge, Mass.).
- K: J.M. Kemble, Codex Diplomaticus Aevi Saxonici, 6 Vols. (1839-48).
- Ker, N.R., 1957: Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon (Oxford).
- Keynes, S.D., 1976: Studies on Anglo-Saxon Royal Diplomas, Trinity College, Cambridge, Fellowship Thesis, 2 Vols.
- Keynes, S.D., 1980: The Diplomas of King Æthelred 'the Unready' (Cambridge).
- Keynes, S.D. and Lapidge, M., 1983: Alfred the Great.
- Knowles, D., 1966: The Monastic Order in England (Cambridge).
- Knowles et al., 1972: D. Knowles, C.N.L. Brooke and V.C.M. London, The Heads of Religious Houses in England and Wales 940-1216 (Cambridge).

- Lapidge, M., 1982a: 'The cult of St. Indract at Glastonbury', Ireland in Early Medieval Europe, ed. D. Whitelock, R. McKitterick and D. Dumville (Cambridge), pp. 179-212.
- Lapidge, M., 1982b: 'Beowulf, Aldhelm, the Liber Monstrorum and Wessex', Studi Medievali (Spoleto), pp. 151-92.
- Lapidge, M. and Herren, M.: Aldhelm The Prose Works (Cambridge 1979).
- Levison, Boniface: Willibald's Life of Boniface, Vitae Sancti Bonifatii Archiepiscopi Moguntini, ed. W. Levison, MGH, Scriptores rerum Germanicarum, Vol. 57, (Hanover, 1905).
- Levison, W., 1935: 'Bede as historian', Bede, His Life, Times and Writings, ed. A. Hamilton-Thompson (Oxford), pp. 111-151.
- Levison, W., 1946: England and the Continent in the Eighth Century (Oxford).
- Lindsay, W.M., 1912: Early Welsh Script (Oxford).
- Loyd, L.C. and Stenton, D.M., 1950: Sir Christopher Hatton's Book of Seals, The Publications of the Northamptonshire Record Society, Vol. 15.
- Luard, Winchester Annals: Annales Monasterii de Wintonia, Annales Monastici II, ed. H.R. Luard, Rolls Series, Vol. 36 (1865).
- Magoun, F.P., 1939: 'Aldhelm's diocese of Serborne be westan wuda', Harvard Theological Review, Vol. 32, pp. 103-114.
- Manchester, K., 1983: The Archaeology of Disease (Bradford).
- Meritt, H., 1934: 'Old English entries in a manuscript at Bern', The Journal of English and Germanic Philology. Vol. 33, pp. 343-51.
- MGH: Monumenta Germaniae Historica.
- Morland, S.C., 1982: 'The Saxon charters for Sowey and Pouholt and the course of the river Cary', Notes and Queries for Somerset and Dorset, Vol. 31, pp. 233-5.
- Napier and Stevenson: The Crawford Collection of Early Charters and Documents, ed. A.S. Napier and W.H. Stevenson (Oxford 1895).
- Orme, N., 1980: 'The church in Crediton from Saint Boniface to the Reformation', Reuter 1980, pp. 95-131.
- Padel, O.J., 1979: 'The text of the Lanlawren charter', Cornish Studies, Vol. 7, pp. 43-4.
- Page, R.I., 1965-6: 'Anglo-Saxon episcopal lists', Nottingham Medieval Studies; Parts I and II: Vol. 9 (1965), pp. 71-95; Part III: Vol. 10 (1966), pp. 2-24.
- Parkes, M., 1976: 'The handwriting of St. Boniface: a reassessment of the problems', Beiträge zur Geschichte der Deutschen Sprache und Literatur, Vol. 98, pp. 161-79.
- Picken, W.M.M., 1956-8: 'Callington and Kelliwic', Devon and Cornwall Notes and Queries, Vol. 27, pp. 225-6.

- Plummer, C., 1896: Bede, Opera Historica (Oxford).
- Plummer, C., 1899: Two of the Saxon Chronicles Parallel (Oxford).
- PN Berkshire: M. Gelling, The Place-Names of Berkshire, 3 Vols., English Place-Name Society, Vol. 49 (Cambridge 1973-6).
- PN Devon: J.E.B. Gover, A. Mawer and F.M. Stenton, The Place-Names of Devon, 2 Vols., English Place-Name Society, Vol. 8 (Cambridge 1931-2).
- PN Gloucestershire: A.H. Smith, The Place-Names of Gloucestershire, English Place-Name Society, Vol. 38 (Cambridge 1964-5).
- PN Surrey: J.E.B. Gover, A. Mawer and F.M. Stenton, with A. Bonner, The Place-Names of Surrey (Cambridge, 1934), English Place-Name Society, Vol. 11.
- PN Wiltshire: J.E.B. Gover, A. Mawer and F.M. Stenton, The Place-Names of Wiltshire, English Place-Name Society, Vol. 16, (Cambridge 1939).
- PN Worcestershire: A. Mawer and F.M. Stenton, The Place-Names of Worcestershire, English Place-Name Society, Vol. 4 (Cambridge 1927).
- Poole, R.L., 1915: Lectures on the History of the Papal Chancery (Cambridge).
- Reuter, T., 1980: The Greatest Englishman (Exeter).
- Richter, M., 1973: Canterbury Professions, The Canterbury and York Society, Vol. 67.
- Robertson, Charters: Anglo-Saxon Charters, ed. A.J. Robertson (second edition, Cambridge 1956).
- Robertson, Laws: The Laws of the Kings of England from Edmund to Henry I, ed. & trans. A.J. Robertson (Cambridge, 1925).
- Robinson, J.A., 1921: Somerset Historical Essays.
- Rogers, I.H.L., 1981: 'The oldest West-Saxon text?', The Review of English Studies, Vol. 32, pp. 257-66.
- Rollason, D.W., 1978: 'Lists of saints' resting-places in Anglo-Saxon England', ASE, Vol. 7, pp. 61-94.
- Rollason, D.W., 1983: 'The cult of murdered royal saints in Anglo-Saxon England', ASE, Vol. 11, pp. 1-22.
- S: P.H. Sawyer, Anglo-Saxon Charters: An Annotated List and Bibliography, Royal Historical Society Guides and Handbooks, No. 8 (1968).
- Sawyer, P.H., ed., Textus Roffensis, Early Eng. MSS in Fac., Vols. 7, 11 (Copenhagen, 1957, 1962).
- Sawyer, P.H., 1978: From Roman Britain to Norman England.
- Sawyer, P.H. and Wood, I.N., 1977: Early Medieval Kingship (Leeds).
- Scharer, A., 1982: Die angelsächsische Königsurkunde im 7 und 8. Jahrhundert (Vienna).

- Schiaparelli, Cod. Dip. Longobardo: Codice Diplomatico Longobardo, ed. L. Schiaparelli, Fonti per la Storia d'Italia, Vols. 62-3 (Rome 1929-33).
- Sims-Williams, P., 1975: 'Continental influence at Bath monastery in the seventh century', ASE, Vol. 4, pp. 1-10.
- Sisam, K., 1932: 'Cynewulf and his poetry', Proceedings of the British Academy, Vol. 18, pp. 303-31.
- Sisam, K., 1953: 'Anglo-Saxon royal genealogies', Proceedings of the British Academy, Vol. 39, pp. 287-348.
- Smart, V., 1981: Sylloge of Coins of the British Isles, Vol. 28, Cumulative Index of Vols. 1-20.
- Smith, A.H., 1965: 'The Hwicce', Medieval and Linguistic Studies in Honour of F.P. Magoun Jr., ed. J.B. Bessinger and R.P. Creed, pp. 56-65.
- Stenton, D.M., 1970: Preparatory to Anglo-Saxon England (Oxford).
- Stenton, F.M., 1913: The Early History of the Abbey of Abingdon (Oxford).
- Stenton, F.M., 1918a: 'The supremacy of the Mercian kings', Stenton 1970, pp. 48-66.
- Stenton, F.M., 1918b: Review of 'The Golden Days of the Early English Church' by Sir H.H. Howarth, English Historical Review, Vol. 33, pp. 255-9.
- Stenton, F.M., 1925: 'The South-Western element in the Old English Chronicle', Stenton 1970, pp. 106-15.
- Stenton, F.M., 1933: 'Medeshamstede and its colonies', Stenton 1970, pp. 179-92.
- Stenton, F.M., 1934: 'Pre-Conquest Herefordshire', Stenton 1970, pp. 193-202.
- Stenton, F.M., 1935: 'St. Frideswide and her times', Stenton 1970, pp. 224-33.
- Stenton, F.M., 1955: The Latin Charters of the Anglo-Saxon Period, (Oxford).
- Stenton, F.M., 1971: Anglo-Saxon England (third edition, Oxford).
- Stephens, J.N., 1977: 'Bede's Ecclesiastical History', History, Vol. 62, pp. 1-14.
- Stevenson, Abingdon Chron.: Chronicon Monasterii de Abingdon, ed. J. Stevenson, Rolls Series, Vol. 2 (1858).
- Stevenson, Asser: Asser's Life of King Alfred, ed. W.H. Stevenson (Oxford 1959).
- Stevenson, W.H., 1914: 'Trinoda necessitas', English Historical Review, Vol. 29, pp. 689-703.

- Stubbs, W., 1883: Chronicles of the Reigns of Edward I and Edward II, Vol. II, Rolls Series, Vol. 76.
- Tangl: Die Briefe Des Heiligen Bonifatius und Lullus, ed. M. Tangl, MGH, Epistolae Selectae I (Berlin 1916).
- Taylor, C.S., 1900: 'Bath, Mercian and West Saxon', Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society, Vol. 23, pp. 129-61.
- Taylor, H.M. and J., 1965-78: Anglo-Saxon Architecture, 3 Vols. (Cambridge).
- Tessier, G., 1962: Diplomatique Royale Française (Paris).
- Thacker, A.T., 1981: 'Some terms for noblemen in Anglo-Saxon England, c. 650-900', Anglo-Saxon Studies in Archaeology and History, Vol. 2, ed. D. Brown, J. Campbell and S.C. Hawkes, BAR Vol. 92, pp. 201-236.
- Turner, St. Augustine's Cart. : The Register of St. Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury, commonly called the Black Book, ed. G.J. Turner and H.E. Salter (Oxford 1915).
- Uddholm, Marculf: Marculf's Formulary, ed. A. Uddholm (Uppsala 1962).
- VCH: The Victoria History of the Counties of England.
- Walker, H.E., 1956: 'Bede and the Gewissae: the political evolution of the Heptarchy and its nomenclature', Cambridge Historical Journal, Vol. 12, Part 2, pp. 174-86.
- Wallace-Hadrill, J.M., 1950: 'The Franks and the English in the ninth century', History, Vol. 35, pp. 202-18.
- Wallace-Hadrill, J.M., 1975: Early Medieval History (Oxford).
- Wallenberg, J.K., 1931: Kentish Place-Names, Uppsala Universitets Arsskrift.
- Watkin, Glastonbury Cart.: The Great Chartulary of Glastonbury, ed. A. Watkin, Somerset Record Society, Vols. 59, 63, 64 (1947, 1952, 1956).
- Weaver, Glastonbury Feodary: A Feodary of Glastonbury Abbey, ed. F.W. Weaver, Somerset Record Society, Vol. 26 (1910).
- Wells, B.W., 1891: 'Eddi's Life of Wilfrid', English Historical Review, Vol. 6, pp. 535-50.
- Whitelock, D., 1951: The Audience of Beowulf (Oxford).
- Williams, A., 1968: A History of Dorset, Vol. III, VCH.
- Winterbottom, M., 1977: 'Aldhelm's prose style and its origins', ASE, Vol. 6, pp. 39-76.
- Winterbottom, Three Saints: Three Lives of English Saints, ed. M. Winterbottom (Toronto, 1972).

- Wormald, C.P., 1976: 'Bede and Benedict Biscop', Famulus Christi, ed. G. Bonner, pp. 141-169.
- Wormald, C.P., 1978: 'Bede, Beowulf and the conversion of the Anglo-Saxon aristocracy', Bede and Anglo-Saxon England, ed. R.T. Farrell, British Archaeological Reports, Vol. 46, pp. 32-95.
- Wormald, C.P., 1983: 'Bede, the Bretwaldas and the origins of the Gens Anglorum', Ideal and Reality in Frankish and Anglo-Saxon Society, ed. C.P. Wormald (Oxford), pp. 99-129.
- Wormald, C.P., 1984: Bede and the Conversion of England: The Charter Evidence, Jarrow Lecture.
- Wormald, F., 1934: English Kalendars Before AD 1100, Henry Bradshaw Society, Vol. 72.
- Wormald, F., 1957: 'The Sherborne "Chartulary"', Fritz Saxl 1890-1948, A Volume of Memorial Essays from his Friends in England, ed. D. J. Gordon, pp. 101-19.
- Young, G.M., 1934: The Origin of the West-Saxon Kingdom (Oxford).

